

**City Council
Finance Committee
Meeting Agenda
Friday, June 15, 2018
City Hall – Spruce Room
749 Main Street
7:30 a.m.**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Agenda
- IV. Approval of the Minutes from the May 22, 2018 Meeting (page 2)
- V. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
- VI. Discussion on Recreation Center Sales Tax and TABOR Issues (page 6)
- VII. Discussion on Fees, Rates, & Charges (page 18)
- VIII. Discussion on Programs, Goals, & Key Performance Indicators (page 29)
- IX. Discussion on Asset Renewal and Replacement for Recreation Center (page 89)
- X. Discussion on Asset Renewal and Replacement for Golf Course (page 91)
- XI. Staff Reports/Discussions
 - Analysis of “Outside City” by Industry
- XII. Possible Discussion Items for Next Regular Meeting – Scheduled for Friday, July 16, 2018 at 7:30 a.m.
 - Presentation of CAFR and Discussion with Independent Auditors, Eide Bailly
 - Financial Policies
- XIII. Adjourn



City Council Finance Committee

Meeting Minutes

**Monday, May 22, 2018
City Hall, Spruce Room
749 Main Street**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following were present:

City Council: Mayor Muckle, Council Member Maloney, and Council Member Lipton

Staff/Others Present: Heather Balser, City Manager, Kevin Watson, Finance Director, Rob Zuccaro, Planning & Building Safety Director, Joe Stevens, Parks and Recreation Director, Kathleen Hix, HR Director, David Dean, Golf Course Superintendent, David Baril, Head Golf Course Professional, Cara Golden, Accounting Manager, and Emily Hogan, Assistant to the City Manager

Absent: None

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 16, 2018 MEETING

The Finance Committee Members approved the April 16, 2018 meeting minutes as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

DISCUSSION ON FEE CALCULATIONS

Emily Hogan, Assistant to the City Manager, presented information on how staff adjust charges/fees for services each year. Ms. Hogan also presented options for a fee rate escalator and a list of fees that the escalator would be applied to. Staff's recommendation was that the fees and fines continue to be updated annually without applying an automatic escalator.

The Committee disagreed with staff's recommendation and requested that staff bring this issue forward at the June meeting and present an alternative escalator based on the City's cost of providing services. The Committee requested that the escalator be defensible and easy to calculate. The Committee also directed that the escalator not be applied to fees that are subject to other rate-setting methodologies, such as fees related to the City's Utilities, Golf Course, Cemetery, and Recreation Center.

The Committee directed staff to hire any outside assistance necessary to complete the Building Permit Fee review.

The corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

DISCUSSION ON ASSET RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT FOR GOLF COURSE

Joe Stevens, Parks and Recreation Director, presented analysis of purchasing versus leasing of grounds maintenance equipment. The Committee requested that staff extend the analysis out for 25 years, show the differences in cost between the two approaches, and present again at the June Finance Committee Meeting..

The corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

REVIEW OF UPCOMING BUDGET AMENDMENT

Kevin Watson, Finance Director presented a preliminary draft of the budget amendment schedules for June 5, 2018. The Committee review the carry over amendments and the project amendments.

The corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

TURNBACK DISCUSSION

Finance Director Watson presented the 2017“turnback” and review the average turnback amounts since 2000.

The corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

QUARTERLY SALES TAX REPORT

Finance Director Watson presented the Quarterly Sales Tax Report.

The report and corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

QUARTERLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Finance Director Watson presented the Quarterly Financial Statements.

The statements and corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

QUARTERLY CASH & INVESTMENT REPORT

Finance Director Watson presented the Quarterly Sales Tax Report.

The report and corresponding narrative can be located in the packet of the May 22, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.

STAFF REPORTS

There were no staff reports.

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING

The next regular Finance Committee Meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 15, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.

Items scheduled for discussion at the next meeting include:

- Discussion on Recreation Center Sales Tax
- Discussion Fee Inflator/Escalator


- Recreation Center Equipment Replacement
- Golf Course Equipment Replacement

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Louisville City Council Finance Committee
Heather Balser, City Manager
Kevin Watson, Finance Director

FROM: Samuel J. Light /s/ 
Nicolas D. Cotton-Baez /s/

DATE: June 11, 2018

RE: City Recreation Sales and Use Tax - Excess Revenue
Obligations under Taxpayer's Bill of Rights (TABOR)

Introduction. The City anticipates its 2018 sales and use tax revenue from the 0.15 percent recreation tax will exceed the estimate used in connection with Ballot Issue 2B, approved by the voters in November 2016. This memo outlines TABOR requirements related to the receipt of such excess tax revenues, and outlines for the Committee's discussion options for how the City might address these issues.

Background. At the November 8, 2016 election, City voters approved the following ballot issue:

SHALL CITY OF LOUISVILLE TAXES BE INCREASED \$575,000 IN 2018 AND THEN ANNUALLY BY WHATEVER ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS ARE RAISED THEREAFTER FROM THE LEVY OF AN ADDITIONAL SALES AND USE TAX OF 0.15 PERCENT BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2018 AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER; WITH SUCH TAX TO BE IMPOSED ONLY IF REFERRED MEASURE 2A, REFERRED TO REGISTERED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AT THE NOVEMBER 8, 2016, ELECTION, IS APPROVED BY A MAJORITY OF SUCH ELECTORS; WITH THE NET PROCEEDS OF SUCH SALES AND USE TAX TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT FOR OPERATING AND MAINTAINING THE LOUISVILLE RECREATION/SENIOR CENTER AND POOL FACILITIES AT MEMORY SQUARE PARK; AND SHALL THE CITY BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND ALL REVENUES DERIVED FROM SUCH SALES AND USE TAX AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

In connection with new taxes, TABOR requires the distribution of a ballot issue notice which, as pertinent here, requires the City disclose: "For the first full fiscal year of each proposed district [City] tax increase, district estimates of the dollar amount of each increase and of district fiscal year

spending without the increase.” TABOR §20(3)(b)(iii). For 2018, the first year of collection of the recreation tax, the notice estimated the dollar amount of the increase to be \$575,000. It estimated 2018 fiscal year spending without the increase to be \$33,470,000. A copy of the notice is attached.

Currently, the Finance Department estimates that 2018 revenues from the recreation tax will be \$908,900, and that 2018 fiscal year spending will be \$37,903,000, both in excess of the estimates in the ballot issue notice. The actual amounts cannot be confirmed until after the end of the year.

TABOR includes a specific provision addressing amounts in excess of estimates contained in the ballot issue notice, which states as follows:

Except by later voter approval, if a tax increase or fiscal year spending exceeds any estimate in (b)(iii) for the same fiscal year, the tax increase is thereafter reduced up to 100% in proportion to the combined dollar excess, and the combined excess revenue refunded in the next fiscal year. District bonded debt shall not issue on terms that could exceed its share of its maximum repayment costs in (b)(iv). Ballot titles for tax or bonded debt increases shall begin, "SHALL (DISTRICT) TAXES BE INCREASED (first, or if phased in, final, full fiscal year dollar increase) ANNUALLY...?" or "SHALL (DISTRICT) DEBT BE INCREASED (principal amount), WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF (maximum total district cost), ...?"

TABOR §3(c)(emphasis added). Thus, absent “later voter approval,” this provision appears to require two actions to be taken if a tax increase or fiscal year spending exceeds an estimate in the ballot issue notice: (1) a refund of the excess revenue collected; and (2) a rate reduction in proportion to the excess revenue collected. These issues are discussed in turn.

Refund of Excess Revenue. While there is currently pending litigation regarding TABOR’s refund language (discussed below), Section (3)(c) of TABOR has generally been interpreted to require, in this instance, that the City refund amounts collected in 2018 in excess of \$575,000, unless the voters approve another ballot issue allowing the City to retain the excess revenue.¹ If the City Council determines to make a refund, the following are some pertinent points:

- TABOR Section 3(c) requires excess tax revenue to be refunded “in the next fiscal year.” For the recreation tax, this means before December 31, 2019.
- If excess tax revenue is not refunded by the end of the next fiscal year, TABOR Section 1 authorizes enforcement actions to force the refund of “[r]evenue collected, kept, or spent illegally since four full fiscal years before the suit is filed.” In other words, if the City did not obtain voter approval to retain the excess revenue collected in 2018 and failed to refund that revenue by December 31, 2019, a plaintiff with standing could bring a suit to force the refund at any time prior to December 31, 2023.
- Section 1 of TABOR permits municipalities to use “any reasonable method” to refund excess revenue, and provides that “[r]efunds need not be proportional when prior payments are impractical to identify or return.”

¹ TABOR does not prohibit the receipt of excess revenue in the first place; that is, the City is not required to reduce the tax rate or take other action to forestall the receipt of excess revenue in the first year, though it could do so if desired in an effort to keep collections under the estimate.

- Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.) Section 39-1-111.5 expressly authorizes a temporary mill levy reduction or temporary property tax credit in order to effect a TABOR refund. This section also includes a legislative declaration that the procedures set forth therein “shall be deemed to be a reasonable method for effecting refunds in accordance with [TABOR].” If desired, the refund method authorized by this statute can be used to refund excess revenue attributable to sales and use tax.
- While there is no reported appellate case specifically holding that excess sales and use tax revenue may be refunded through utility bill credits, this method has been used at the state and local level without challenge. Further, we do not think a utility bill credit would face any different proportionality issue than use of a temporary property tax credit or mill levy reduction. If a utility bill credit is used, the legislative declaration in C.R.S. §39-1-111.5 would not apply but, as noted above, TABOR itself authorizes any reasonable refund method, and states refunds need not be proportional when prior payments are impractical to identify or return, which is the case for many retail sales tax transactions.
- Interest is not required to be paid on the excess revenue collected *unless* such revenue is not refunded in the next fiscal year *and* suit is brought to force a refund, in which case the excess revenue will be ordered refunded with 10% annual simple interest from the “initial conduct” (i.e., December 31, 2019). See TABOR §§ 1 and 3(c).

Rate Reduction. As noted above, TABOR Section 3(c) also states that if a tax increase exceeds an estimate in the ballot issue notice for the same fiscal year, “the tax increase is thereafter reduced up to 100% in proportion to the combined dollar excess...”. Thus, absent “later voter approval,” this language appears to require the City reduce the rate of the tax on a going forward basis if revenues exceed estimates for the first full year of collection.

TABOR is not clear when the rate reduction must be applied. In a legal memo addressing the State’s obligations with respect to excess marijuana taxes, the Office of Legislative Legal Services interpreted TABOR to require the rate reduction to begin with the next fiscal year—i.e. beginning January 1, 2019 as applied to the City’s recreation tax. TABOR is also unclear on how to reduce the rate “in proportion to the combined dollar excess.” This language could mean that the amount of combined dollar excess is compared to the amounts actually brought in, or, alternatively, compared to the estimated tax increase, to determine the percentage by which the rate would then be reduced. Finally, it is not clear how “de-Brucing” language in a ballot issue may affect the rate reduction requirement.

The Colorado appellate courts have not issued an opinion on these issues, though there is currently pending litigation in this area (discussed below). This dearth of case law is due in part to the limited instances of revenues exceeding estimates and that where this has occurred, jurisdictions have obtained later voter approval to retain revenues generated by the previously approved tax. However, we understand several jurisdictions are currently facing this issue because of strong revenue growth.

Later Voter Approval. As noted above, TABOR Section 3(c) requires a rate reduction and refund, “except by later voter approval.” Thus, the City could refer a ballot issue to the voters requesting approval to retain excess revenue and/or maintain the previously approved tax rate. While it may be

possible to put such a question on the November 2018 ballot, it is not certain whether the timing of such a question constitutes “later voter approval” because the first year of tax collection is not over, and thus the refund liability has not yet accrued. However, subject to this potential risk, the City could refer a ballot issue in 2018 or, alternatively, do so in November 2019. If a question in either year did not pass, the City would have until December 31, 2019 to effect a refund without the risk of liability for interest.

Pending Litigation. TABOR’s refund and rate reduction provisions were recently addressed in an El Paso County District Court case styled as Bruce v. El Paso County, Case No. 2017CV156. In this case, Douglas Bruce alleged that the County violated TABOR by collecting and retaining, year over year, sales tax revenues in excess of the amount estimated when the tax was approved in 2012.² In his Complaint, Mr. Bruce demanded a reduction in the rate of the tax and a refund of amounts collected each year in excess of the estimate, plus interest.

In its Order granting the County’s motion to dismiss, the trial court ruled that the “de-Brucing” language in the County ballot issue exempted the tax from TABOR’s restrictions, including the “except by later approval” language contained within Section (3)(c), effectively holding that the County did not have a refund obligation for even the first year of collection, or any rate reduction obligation. This Order (copy enclosed) is only a district court decision, and thus would not be binding, for example, on a Boulder County District Court, and the decision differs from some other interpretations of the “later voter approval” requirement. Nonetheless, the decision holds that “de-Brucing” language, similar to that contained in the City’s recreation tax question, eliminates any refund or rate reduction obligation. We understand Mr. Bruce has appealed the case and may be seeking direct review by the Colorado Supreme Court. Thus, it is possible this case will generate appellate law interpreting the rate reduction and refund obligations the City may face regarding the recreation tax.

Summary of Options. To assist your June 15 discussion, the following is a summary of potential options for addressing these issues:

- Direct a refund of 2018 excess revenue in 2019 and reduce the tax rate.
- Refer a ballot issue to the voters requesting approval to keep all revenues from the tax and to continue the tax at the 0.15% rate.
- Direct action be taken in 2018 to avoid collection of revenues in excess of the estimate.
- Take a wait-and-see approach and defer decisions on this issue until the first or second quarter of 2019, by which time there may be further developments in the Bruce case. At that time the City will also have actual revenue amounts for the 2018 fiscal year.

We will be available at your June 15 meeting to further discuss these issues.

² Specifically, the County in 2012 voted to increase the sales tax rate 0.23% and estimated the dollar amount of the increase at \$17 million. Mr. Bruce alleged the County received about \$875,000 more than the estimated amount and that under TABOR Section 3(c), the County was obligated to refunds \$875,000 each year, plus 10% interest.

CITY OF LOUISVILLE

TO: ALL REGISTERED VOTERS

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE

CITY OF LOUISVILLE
BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO

ELECTION DATE: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2016
ELECTION HOURS: 7:00 A.M. TO 7:00 P.M.

LOCAL ELECTION OFFICE ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE
NUMBER:
BOULDER COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER
ELECTIONS DIVISION
1750 33RD STREET, SUITE 200
BOULDER, CO 80301
TELEPHONE: 303-413-7740

CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO
DESIGNATED ELECTION OFFICIAL
MEREDYTH MUTH, CITY CLERK
749 MAIN STREET
LOUISVILLE, CO 80027
TELEPHONE: 303-335-4536

CITY OF LOUISVILLE BALLOT ISSUE 2A

BALLOT TITLE AND TEXT:

SHALL CITY OF LOUISVILLE DEBT BE INCREASED \$28,600,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF UP TO \$45,400,000; AND SHALL CITY OF LOUISVILLE TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$1,820,000 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY SUCH DEBT FROM AN ADDITIONAL AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY NOT TO EXCEED 3.350 MILLS TO BE IMPOSED FOR A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED TWENTY FIVE YEARS; SUCH DEBT AND TAXES TO BE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING, EXPANDING AND RENOVATING THE LOUISVILLE RECREATION/SENIOR CENTER AND THE POOL FACILITIES AT MEMORY SQUARE PARK, TO INCLUDE ALL NECESSARY LAND, EQUIPMENT, FURNISHINGS, IMPROVEMENTS AND INCIDENTALS FOR SUCH FACILITIES; SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS OR BONDS ISSUED TO REFUND SUCH BONDS; SUCH BONDS TO BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE IN AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM AUTHORIZED PRINCIPAL AMOUNT AND REPAYMENT COSTS, ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS THE CITY COUNCIL MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF A PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND TAXES, AND ANY INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

CITY OF LOUISVILLE BALLOT ISSUE 2B

BALLOT TITLE AND TEXT:

SHALL CITY OF LOUISVILLE TAXES BE INCREASED \$575,000 IN 2018 AND THEN ANNUALLY BY WHATEVER ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS ARE RAISED THEREAFTER FROM THE LEVY OF AN ADDITIONAL SALES AND USE TAX OF 0.15 PERCENT BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2018 AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER; WITH SUCH TAX TO BE IMPOSED ONLY IF REFERRED MEASURE 2A, REFERRED TO REGISTERED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AT THE NOVEMBER 8, 2016, ELECTION, IS APPROVED BY A MAJORITY OF SUCH ELECTORS; WITH THE NET PROCEEDS OF SUCH SALES AND USE TAX TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT FOR OPERATING AND MAINTAINING THE LOUISVILLE RECREATION/SENIOR CENTER AND POOL FACILITIES AT MEMORY SQUARE PARK; AND SHALL THE CITY BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND ALL REVENUES DERIVED FROM SUCH SALES AND USE TAX AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Information

Total City Fiscal Year Spending

Fiscal Year

2016 (estimated)	\$ 32,410,000
2015 (actual)	\$ 27,973,744
2014 (actual)	\$ 25,247,247
2013 (actual)	\$ 24,439,278
2012 (actual)	\$ 23,772,123

Overall percentage change from 2012 to 2016
36.3%

Overall dollar change from 2012 to 2016
\$ 8,637,877

Proposed Tax Increase

City Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase for Fiscal Year 2017 (the First Full Fiscal Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):
BALLOT ISSUE NO. 2A: \$ 1,820,000

City Estimate of 2017 Fiscal Year Spending*
Without Proposed Tax Increase: \$ 31,425,000

City Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase for Fiscal Year 2018 (the First Full Fiscal Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):
BALLOT ISSUE NO. 2B: \$ 575,000

City Estimate of 2018 Fiscal Year Spending*
Without Proposed Tax Increase: \$ 33,470,000
*Fiscal year spending without the proposed tax increases does not include proceeds of bonded debt, lease purchase

CITY OF LOUISVILLE

agreements or other borrowings which may occur in such fiscal years.

Information on City's Proposed Debt

BALLOT ISSUE NO. 2A:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:
Not to exceed \$ 28,600,000

Maximum Annual City Repayment Cost:
Not to exceed \$ 1,820,000

Total City Repayment Cost:
Not to exceed \$ 45,400,000

Information on City's Current Debt *

Principal Amount Outstanding Debt:\$ 2,635,000
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:\$ 497,900
Remaining Total Repayment Cost: \$ 2,937,677
(All amounts @ 09/23/2016)

*Excluded from debt are enterprise and annual appropriation obligations.

Summary of Written Comments FOR Ballot Issue No. 2A:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of Written Comments AGAINST Ballot Issue No. 2A:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of Written Comments FOR Ballot Issue No. 2B:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of Written Comments AGAINST Ballot Issue No. 2B:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

El Paso County, CO, District Court Court Address: P.O. Box 2980 270 S. Tejon Colorado Springs, CO 80901-2980 Phone Number: (719) 452-5275	DATE FILED: March 8, 2018 CASE NUMBER: 2017CV156 ▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
DOUGLAS BRUCE PLAINTIFF vs EL PASO COUNTY DEFENDANT	Case Number: 2017CV156 Division 3, Courtroom S406
ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO C.R.C.P 12(b)(5)	

I. JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is proper in the El Paso County District Court. Although Plaintiff has failed to comply with C.R.S. § 30-11-105, which provides that all proceedings against a Colorado county must be brought against "The board of county commissioners of the county". The Board of County Commissioners of the County of El Paso waives any objection it has to jurisdiction.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, made pursuant to Rule 12(b)(5) of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure, may be granted if the plaintiff's factual allegations cannot support a claim as a matter of law. *Asphalt Specialties, Co. v. City of Commerce City*, 218 P.3d 741 (Colo. App. 2009). In reviewing such a motion, a court must accept all

material facts in the complaint as true and view all allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.

The Plaintiff has requested oral argument and a hearing because “ facts and law are in serious dispute”. The request is denied. For purposes of this Motion, all material facts in the Complaint are assumed truthful and the question before the Court is whether the allegations can support a claim as a matter of law.

III STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND ALLEGATIONS

On September 6, 2012, the Board of El Paso County Commissioners passed a resolution to refer a measure for the November 2012 election seeking voter approval to increase El Paso County’s sales and use tax rate to address certain public safety needs of the El Paso County Sheriff’s Office. The measure was designated “1A” by the El Paso County Clerk and Recorder’s Office.

Pursuant to the Taxpayers Bill of Rights (TABOR), a Notice of Election was mailed to all registered voters in El Paso County which contained information regarding measure 1A. El Paso County voters approved measure 1A. Starting in 2013, El Paso County has been collecting revenues from 1A for the purposes stated within the ballot measure.

The Plaintiff alleges that language in TABOR requires the county to refund to the taxpayers certain calculated revenues that exceed the estimate of revenues per TABOR. The Defendant asserts that the language of the measure preempts the statutory provision for reimbursement because the measure included authority from the voters to keep and use all revenues collected.

IV CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Under Colo. Const. art X, § 20(3)(b), when proposing a tax increase, a county must mail an election notice to all registered voters in its jurisdiction with content requirements as set forth in the same section. Pursuant to Colo. Const. art X, § 20(3)(b)(iii), the county must provide, for the first full fiscal year of the increase, estimates of the maximum dollar amount of the tax increase and of the fiscal year spending without the increase. Colo. Const. art X, § 20(3)(c) states that except by later voter approval, if a tax increase or fiscal year spending exceeds any estimate in (b)(iii) for the same fiscal year, the tax increase is thereafter reduced and refunded.

The Colorado Supreme Court has identified three situations in which the voters must approve the collection, retention or expenditure of an increase in government revenue, one of which exists when such revenue exceeds the election notice estimate. *City of Aurora v. Acosta*, 892 P.2d 264, 268 (Colo. 1995). Because voter approval to allow a variation from the otherwise applicable limits is mandated by TABOR, any interpretation of TABOR which would limit the right of the electorate to vote on tax or spending proposals is not favored. *Havens v. Bd. of County Com'rs of County of Archuleta*, 924 P.2d 517, 520 (Colo. 1996).

Defendant's measure 1A contained the following language:

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY TAXES BE INCREASED BY
APPROXIMATELY \$17 MILLION ANNUALLY TO DIRECTLY FUND THE
URGENT PUBLIC SAFETY NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY EL PASO COUNTY
SHERIFF TERRY MAKETA, THE CHIEF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL

SERVING ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITIES, TOWNS AND UNINCORPORATED AREAS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF EL PASO COUNTY, AS CRITICAL TO PERFORMING HIS STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS TO ALL EL PASO COUNTY RESIDENTS, BY INCREASING THE COUNTY'S SALES AND USE TAX RATE BY TWENTY-THREE HUNDREDTHS OF ONE CENT (\$0.0023) PER DOLLAR PURSUANT TO PART 1 OF ARTICLE 2 OF TITLE 29, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES;

...

WITH ALL REVENUES GENERATED AND THE EARNINGS ON SUCH REVENUE TO BE COLLECTED AND SPENT EACH YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATION BY THE REVENUE AND SPENDING LIMITS OF, AND WITHOUT AFFECTING THE COUNTY'S ABILITY TO COLLECT AND SPEND OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS UNDER, ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION...?

The Court finds that the language in measure 1A specifically asks the voters whether taxes shall be increased and whether all revenues generated from such tax and the earnings thereon may be exempted from the revenue and spending limits of TABOR. In approving measure 1A, El Paso County voters voted to lift all revenue and spending limitations contained in TABOR from the revenue generated by the tax increase.

The Colorado Supreme Court has consistently recognized the power vested in the voters to direct government spending under TABOR. It has stated that: "[t]he will of the electors, when fully and freely expressed, will not be defeated by a strict and technical construction of the law". Bickel v. City of Boulder, 885 P.2d

215, 226 (Colo. 1994). The Colorado Supreme Court also acknowledges that governments must be able to rely on the language and outcome of ballot issues in order to function, explaining that “[r]eliance on the ballot language is especially important for these ballot issues because article X, section 20 relies on voters to make important financial decisions. The issues are often complex... and article X, section 20 provides minimal guidance to taxing authorities seeking voter approval. To make this form of ‘direct democracy’ work, districts must be able to rely on the language of the ballot issues.” Mesa Cty. Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs v. State, 203 P.3d 519, 534 (Colo. 2009).

The Defendant has relied on the text of measure 1A as approved by the voters, which states that 1A is exempt from spending and revenue limits of TABOR. Importantly, the text of measure 1A clearly identifies “all revenue” being exempt from TABOR. This text applies to the first collection under the measure and applies to future years as well. By approving this text, the voters specifically removed measure 1A from TABOR’s restrictions, including the “[e]xcept by later approval...” language contained within (3)(c). It is contradictory that the voters would approve language to except TABOR, only to then be faced with the possibility of additional ballot questions thereafter on the exact same issue.

Accordingly, the Court grants the Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss and Plaintiff’s Complaint is hereby dismissed with prejudice.

Dated this 8th day of March, 2018

BY THE COURT



Thomas K. Kane
District Court Judge

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that on March 8, 2018 a true and correct copy of the foregoing order was filed via US mail to:

Lori Seago, #29458
Senior Assistant County Attorney
200 S. Cascade
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Steven Klaffky, #44836
Assistant County Attorney
200 S. Cascade
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Douglas Bruce
Box 26018
Colorado Springs, CO 80936

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REVIEW OF FEES, RATES AND CHARGES

DATE: JUNE 15, 2018

**PRESENTED BY: EMILY HOGAN, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER
KEVIN WATSON, FINANCE DIRECTOR**

SUMMARY:

Each year the City Council adopts a resolution setting certain fees, rates and charges for the upcoming year. Council also authorizes the City Manager to set certain fees, rates and charges not otherwise set by Council. The fees set by the City Manager include such charges as fees for photo copies, maps and documents, development application reviews, recreation classes, City facility rentals, cemetery plots and services, etc. The City Manager sets these fees and charges to recover costs and defray expenses and not as a mechanism for raising revenue.

Staff reviews the fees, rates and charges annually to determine if adjustments should be made to recover such costs. There are several processes that staff uses to review the rates and fees, including:

- Rate Model or Fee Study – establishes rates or fees to recover operating and capital expenses of City services. This is used for building permits, inspections and review fees, water and sewer rates and taps, etc.
- Community or Market Comparison – compares to other municipalities to determine market for programs and services. This is used for administrative services, fingerprinting, facility rentals, recreation fees, etc.
- Adjustment for Inflation – adjusts rates or fees to account for inflation. This is used for development review applications.

The attached spreadsheets list the rates and fees set by City Council and the City Manager. The rates and fees highlighted in yellow were set using a community or market comparison or adjusted for inflation. An inflator could be applied to these charges to account for the City's increase in expenditures to provide programs and services. Recreation and golf fees have been removed as there is a rate/fee study for these items. The building permit/licensing fees will also be studied in 2018 and the inflator can be applied starting in 2019.

Staff proposes using an inflator of 5% on an annual basis. The calculation of the inflator can be seen in the attached breakdown of wages, benefits, supplies and services. Staff recommends calculating the inflator for the appropriate fees/fines on July 1st with those changes going into effect on the following January 1st of each year. This allows for staff

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REVIEW OF FEES, RATES AND CHARGES**DATE: JUNE 15, 2018****PAGE 2 OF 2**

to compile 6 months of data for wages, benefits, supplies and service before setting the inflator for the following year.

Staff also recommends reserving discretion for applying the inflator in situations where the fee or fine is typically paid in cash, relatively minor, non-competitive in comparison to other municipalities or has a significant administrative impact. The software used to track a fee or fine may also limit the City's ability to apply the inflator. For instance, the City's software for business licenses, ADG, can only round to the nearest dollar. Staff can keep track of the amount a fee or fine should be each year and make adjustments as necessary.

Additionally, there are certain restrictions for liquor fees as set by the Colorado Department of Revenue (CDOR). Staff will monitor the City's liquor fees as the inflator is applied and make sure the fees/fines stay within the allowed range as set by CDOR. The Liquor Licensing Authority (LLA) has not suggested increasing fees to remain business-friendly. Staff recommends that the LLA be consulted before increasing any liquor fees.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Depends on the inflator for the current year.

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM IMPACT:

One of the objectives for the Governance and Administration Sub-Program is ensuring the City has financial capacity to sustain Council's adopted levels of service. Reviewing the fees, rates and charges annually ensures that the City is able to cover the cost of services.

RECOMMENDATION:

Discussion and direction of the proposed changes for the City's fees, rates and charges for 2019.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Council Fees
2. City Manager Fees
3. Calculation of Fee Inflator
4. Liquor Enforcement Division Fee Schedule

Resolution 72, Series 2017						
Exhibit A						
Code Section Ref.	Fee Description	Fee	Additional Fee Information	Staff Responsibility	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
1.24.010	Credit on Fine or for time served	50.00	Per 24hrs.	Deputy Manager		Suggested fine from previous judge
3.20.402.C	Sales/Use Tax License	25.00				Amount was established when the Sales Tax License Fee and the Business License Fee were combined. The fee covers the estimated cost of labor and materials used in processing the licenses. No change is proposed.
				Finance Director		
5.04.070	Business Registration		Replaced by Sales/Use Tax License			
5.08.040	Liquor Application and registration fee		List, see Table 1			State allows City to set within cap as listed in Colorado Department of Revenue Liquor Enforcement Division Fee Schedule. Local Licensing Authority (LLA) has not suggested increasing to remain business friendly. Staff recommends that LLA be consulted before increasing.
5.08.050	Liquor License annual fees (local)		List, see Table 1	Deputy Manager		See above
5.08.070	Liquor Special Event Permit fees		List, see Table 1	Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.060/5.11.060	Marijuana Establishment - Application fees	3,000.00	plus \$100 for fingerprinting and background check			The City can set marijuana fees at our discretion. Similar to liquor, the LLA has not wanted to increase them to be business friendly. Staff doesn't anticipate any changes.
				Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.090.C/5.11.100C	Marijuana Establishment - Late Renewal Application Fee	500.00		Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.100/5.11.100/110	Marijuana Establishment - Annual Renewal/Operating License Fee	1,500.00		Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.130.D/5.11.140D	Marijuana Establishment - Modification of Premises	1,500.00		Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.110.B/5.11.120B	Marijuana Establishment - Change in Location Application Fee	1,500.00		Deputy Manager		See above
5.10.130.C/5.11.140C	Marijuana Establishment - Transfer of Ownership Application Fee	3,000.00		Deputy Manager		See above
5.12.020	Contractor's Licenses, application and fee		List, see Table 4			Intended to cover costs for administering licensing program - no proposed change.
				Planning Director		Established by City Council. There are currently no massage parlors within the City.
5.16.040	Massage Parlor, Application Fee	350.00				See above
5.16.130	Massage Parlor, Initial fee, and annual renewal	350.00	\$150 each renewal	Deputy Manager		No proposed change
5.18.050	Sexually Oriented Businesses, License fee	200.00	Annual	Planning Director		No proposed change
	Sexually Oriented Businesses, Manager fee	50.00		Planning Director		No proposed change
	Sexually Oriented Businesses, Application Fee	500.00		Planning Director		Staff recommends reevaluating as needed
5.20.050	Cable TV system - New Application	1,000.00		Deputy Manager		See above
	Cable TV system - Transfer or Assignment	500.00		Deputy Manager		Fees increased a few years ago. Costs are set to cover staff time and license costs. No changes for 2019.
6.12.060	Dog License - Spayed or Neutered	10.00				See above
	Dog License - Un-Spayed or Un-Neutered	15.00		Deputy Manager		See above
6.20.010	Fowl running at large	0.25	Per fowl	Police Chief		Police Dept not sure - set previously
8.08.030	Cutting Weeds, recoup administrative costs	150.00	Up to			Determined by operating budget & community comparison. Typically adjust up to 6-7%
8.12.200	Arborist License	30.00	Annual	Parks Director		See above
8.40.050	Pest Control, recoup administrative costs	50.00	Up to	Police Chief		Police Dept not sure - set previously
8.64.090	Residential Refuse and Recycling		List, see Table 9 (updated September 3, 2013, Resolution 39, 2013)	Public Works Director		Determined by hauler contract & fund model
9.40.050	Live Music event application fee	20.00		Deputy Manager		Cost to cover staff time and mailing costs. No changes for 2019.
9.60.010	Failure to return processing fee, plus cost of item	5.00		Library Director		Community comparison
10.12.230	Bicycle License Fee		No charge	Police Chief		Theft prevention
10.18.030	Parking Permit Fee		No parking districts currently exist. Fee established by City Council.	City Manager		Reevaluate if Council pursues parking program
12.12.030	Excavation Permit		List, see Table 10	Public Works Director		Community comparison
13.08.130	Turn on water after the violation of supplying water to others	40.00		Public Works Director		Community comparison
13.24.030	Sewer Tap (residential and non-residential)		List, see Table 5	Public Works Director		Fund Model
13.12.090	Water Rates for Usage, residential and non-residential		List, see Table 7	Public Works Director		
	Inside City Limits			Public Works Director		Rate setting
	Outside City Limits		Double In-City rates from Table 7	Public Works Director		Rate setting, ordinance
13.12.080	Bulk Water Rate			Public Works Director		Rate setting
	Weekly Permit Fee	50.00		Public Works Director		Community comparison
	Deposit for Meter	2,500.00		Public Works Director		Staff decision
	Per 1,000 gallons	7.67	\$7.67/1,000 gallons - beginning with the first gallon	Public Works Director		Rate setting
13.28.030	Residential and Non-residential Sewer rates		List, see Table 6	Public Works Director		Fund Model
13.32.110	Cost Recovery Fees for Wastewater (Annual):			Public Works Director		
	Significant Contributor	1,000.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed

Code Section Ref.	Fee Description	Fee	Additional Fee Information	Staff Responsibility	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
	Small Signigicant Contributor	500.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed
	Potential Contributor (Annual):			Public Works Director		
	Class A	500.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed
	Class B	250.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed
	Class C	100.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed
	Class D	50.00		Public Works Director		Staff reviewed
13.32.125	Surcharge rate for excess BOD and TSS (49 - 2017)	0.58	BOD per pound	Public Works Director		Cost of service model
	(Resolution 49, Series 2017)	0.58	TSS per pound	Public Works Director		Cost of service model
	(Resolution 49, Series 2017)	0.58	Oil and Grease per pound	Public Works Director		Cost of service model
13.37.040 E 1.	Storm water Utility Service Fee:			Public Works Director		
	Single Family Residential (Resolution 15, Series 2017)	4.40	Per month - Single and Multi Family	Public Works Director		Fund Model
	All Others (Resolution 15, Series 2017)	4.40	SF of impervious area/3,500 times \$4.23	Public Works Director		Fund Model
14.16.110	Parks, alcohol use	-	Deposit	Parks Director		Determined by operating budget & community comparison. Typically adjust up to 6-7%
Section 15, various	Building Permits, Inspections, and Review Fees		List, see Table 8	Planning Director		Intended to cover all City direct, overhead & consulting costs for administering permit program. Fee study to be conducted in 2018 & could lead to fee update.
15.20.040	Mobile Home, licenses, permits, deposits and fees	10.00	Installer's License	Planning Director		Nominal fee to track code requirement for licensed installers. No proposed change.
		30.00	Water Deposit	Planning Director		Nominal fee to track water connections. No proposed change.
15.24.030	Mobile Home Park operator license	10.00	Operator License	Planning Director		Nominal fee to ensure current registration & annual process for inspections. No proposed change.
17.20.025	Parking Improvement Fee - Downtown (Resolution 25, 2017)	15,759.00	Per parking space	Planning Director		Council resolution - automatically increases per resolution. No proposed change.

FEES ESTABLISHED BY CITY MANAGER
EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2018

Fee Description	Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
General					
City Maps	Zoning Map (24" x 36")	5.00	Planning Director		Community comparison
City Maps	City Street Map (small/color)	6.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	City Street Map (large)	12.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Centerline Map (small)	6.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Centerline Map (large)	19.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Traffic Count Map (free on website)	6.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Utility Atlas Plots - per SF	6.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Custom Maps-Black and White - per SF	4.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Custom Maps – Color Mylar Printing - per SF	6.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
City Maps	Electronic Copies	5.00			
Copies	8.5" x 11" B/W - per page	0.10	Deputy Manager		Policy is meant to promote disclosure of City records to citizens. Policy is to give records at no cost or not greater than actual cost to the City.
Copies	11" x 17" B/W - per page	0.20	Deputy Manager		See above
Copies	24" x 36" B/W - per page	3.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Copies	8.5" x 11" Color - per page	0.50	Deputy Manager		See above
Copies	11" x 17" Color - per page	0.75	Deputy Manager		See above
Copies	Certified Copies - per page	1.25	Deputy Manager		See above
Copies of CD/DVDs		5.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Extra Duty Officers/Supervisor/Police Vehicle	Per hour/Vehicle Per Day Cost	\$63/\$80 Veh. \$50	Police Chief	2018	Set by Boulder County Law Enforcement Agencies
Notary Fee	Resident (1st seal free)	1.25	Deputy Manager	2018	Staff suggests eliminating fee. Most people are residents only asking for one seal. It takes longer to process the payments than we collect in fees.
Notary Fee	Non-Resident (per seal)	5.00	Deputy Manager	2018	Staff suggests eliminating fee. See above.
Mylar Printing	Per page	5.00			
Patio Rental	Per 12-Foot Section	1,000.00	Econ Dev Director	2018	Patio rental fees were raised in 2018 to defray the cost of installation/removal, repairs, maintenance, storage and insurance. These fee changes are advanced through the BRaD Committee.
Photographs	CC & PL (does not include cost of copies)	15.00			
Police Fingerprinting	Resident - Up to (3) Cards	10.00	Police Chief		Similar charge to other agencies
Police Fingerprinting	Resident - More than (3) Cards	20.00	Police Chief		Similar charge to other agencies
Police Fingerprinting	Non-resident - Up to (3) Cards	15.00	Police Chief		Similar charge to other agencies
Police Fingerprinting	Non-resident - More than (3) Cards	30.00	Police Chief		Similar charge to other agencies
Police Reports (Non-electronic)	For Crime victims, or electronic format for anyone	-	Police Chief		Contemporary policing standard to not charge for reports
Police Reports (Non-electronic)	Others (non-crime victims) - Copies charged per public record request schedule	-	Police Chief		Contemporary policing standard to not charge for reports
Postage – Mailing	Charged at standard postal/shipping rate		Deputy Manager		Covers City postal costs
Public Records Research Fee	First 2 hours free, then charged in 15-minute increments - \$20 per hour	20.00	Deputy Manager		Established by policy to meet the intent of the Charter and Colorado Open Records Act rules.
Special Event Permit - Standard		400.00	Deputy Manager		Established few years ago based on costs to cover staff time to process and review permits. No changes for 2019.
Special Event Permit - Small Impact Right-of-Way		50.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Technical Data	City Design Standards	50.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
Technical Data	Storm Drainage Standards	40.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
Technical Data	City Standard Details – CD	25.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
Technical Data	G.I.S. Information – ½ hr. minimum charge of \$25	30.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
Library					
Borrowing late fees	Art prints, Audio books, Books, CDs, Magazines - per day	0.10	Library Director		Flatirons Library Consortium comparison
Borrowing late fees	DVDs, Book club bags, Special Items (telescopes, dolls, etc.) - per day	0.50	Library Director		Flatirons Library Consortium comparison
Collection Agency	Referral Fee - per action, plus cost of item	10.00	Library Director		Based on referral fee charged by material recovery firm
Meeting Room	Non-profit, Non-resident - per hour	25.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Meeting Room	Non-profit, Resident Groups - No charge	-	Library Director		
Meeting Room	"For profit" enterprises - per hour	45.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Study Room	No charge	-	Library Director		
Historic Photographs					
Reproduction Fee	Per image	15.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Commercial Use Fees:					

Fee Description		Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
Published use, less than 5,000 copies	Per image		15.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Published use, more than 5,000 copies	Per image		35.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Display in a business or at an event	Per image		10.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Advertise or promotion	Per image		100.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Websit/Internet	Per year		50.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Film/video production	Per image		100.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Performance or presentation	Per image		50.00	Library Director		Community comparison
Cemetery Fees						
Cemetery Burial Space - Full Size						Determined by operating budget & community comparison. Typically adjust up to 6-7%
	Resident		1,230.00	Parks/Rec Director		
Cemetery Burial Space - Full Size	Non-Resident		3,500.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Cemetery Burial Space - Full Size - Blocks 25 to 29						
	Resident		615.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Cemetery Burial Space - Full Size - Blocks 25 to 29						
	Non-Resident		1,750.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Cremation Burial Space	Resident		675.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Cremation Burial Space	Non-Resident		1,950.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Infant Burial Space	Resident		675.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Infant Burial Space	Non-Resident		2,200.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Cemetery Plot Transfer			45.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Full Burial		1,275.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Infant Size Burial		625.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Cremation Burial		425.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Cremation Burial		460.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Disinterment		1,500.00-3,000.00		Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Less Than 48 Hours Notice		550.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Graves - Open & Close	Overtime for Saturday Burial		550.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Poly Vault	Cremation Burial		150.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Concrete Vault	Cremation Burial		325.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Facility Rentals (Parks and Rec)						
Birthday party package	Resident		70.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Birthday party package	Non-resident		90.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - All Other Park Shelters	Resident - 1st (4) hours		70.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - All Other Park Shelters	Non-Resident - 1st (4) hours		90.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - All Other Park Shelters	Resident - Each additional hour		20.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - All Other Park Shelters	Non-Resident - Each additional hour		25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Arts Center	Resident - per hour		35.00	Deputy Manager		Previously set by Recreation Center at same rate as other facilities
Rooms - Arts Center	Non-resident - per hour		45.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Rooms - Brooks or Crown	Resident - per hour		35.00			Determined by operating budget & community comparison. Typically adjust up to 6-7%
				Parks/Rec Director		
Rooms - Brooks or Crown	Non-resident - per hour		45.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter <100 attendees	Resident - 1st (4) hours		110.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter <100 attendees	Non-Resident - 1st (4) hours		140.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter <100 attendees	Resident - Each additional hour		25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter <100 attendees	Non-Resident - Each additional hour		35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter >100 attendees	Resident - 1st (4) hours		200.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter >100 attendees	Non-Resident - 1st (4) hours		250.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter >100 attendees	Resident - Each additional hour		50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks - Community Park Shelter >100 attendees	Non-Resident Resident - Each additional hour		65.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Garibaldi, Imperial, Paramount	Resident - per hour		25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Garibaldi, Imperial, Paramount	Non-resident - per hour		35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Heritage Street Parking Area	Use of Heritage Street Parking Area - Additional fee		400.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Kitchen	Resident - per hour		15.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Kitchen	Non-resident - per hour		20.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - All Other Park Shelters	Large Group Rates (>150) - Additional fee		100.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - South Gym	Resident - per hour		40.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - South Gym	Non-resident - per hour		60.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Rooms - Steinbaugh Pavillion <100 attendees	1st (4) hours		225.00	Deputy Manager		Previously set by Recreation Center at same rate as other facilities
Rooms - Steinbaugh Pavillion <100 attendees	Each additional hour		50.00	Deputy Manager		See above

Fee Description	Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
Rooms - Steinbaugh Pavillion >100 attendees	1st (4) hours	300.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Rooms - Steinbaugh Pavillion >100 attendees	Each additional hour	75.00	Deputy Manager		See above
Rooms - Steinbaugh Pavillion Non-Profit/Educational	Registered Non-profit or Educational group - per hour (2 hour min)	45.00			
			Deputy Manager		New fee - hourly rate based on 4-hour block rate at non-profit discount
Sports Complex					
Drag, Line, and/or Change Bases	Each occurrence	25.00			Determined by operating budget & community comparison. Typically adjust up to 6-7%
			Parks/Rec Director		
Field Supervisor	Per hour (to be determined by LRC, if needed)	15.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Hourly Rate per Field	Resident	30.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Hourly Rate per Field	Non-Resident	40.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Sat/Sun - Daily Rental (includes all four fields, initial line and drag and lights)	Resident	1,080.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Sat/Sun - Daily Rental (includes all four fields, initial line and drag and lights)	Non-Resident	1,350.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Usage of Lights	Per hour/Per field	30.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Weekday - Daily Rental (includes all four fields, initial line and drag and lights)	Resident	575.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Weekday - Daily Rental (includes all four fields, initial line and drag and lights)	Non-Resident	720.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Other City Sports Fields					
Any day - Daily Rental	Resident	200.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Any day - Daily Rental	Non-Resident	250.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Drag, Line, and/or Change Bases per each occurrence	Each occurrence	25.00			
			Parks/Rec Director		See above
Field Supervisor	Per hour (to be determined by LRC, if needed)	15.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Hourly Rental	Resident	25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Hourly Rental	Non-Resident	35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Tennis Courts		5.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Other Recreation Fees					
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 1 boat/1 year	Resident	20.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 1 boat/2 years	Resident	35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 2 boats/1 year	Resident	40.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 2 boats/2 years	Resident	70.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 1 boat/1 year	Non-Resident	40.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 1 boat/2 years	Non-Resident	70.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 2 boats/1 year	Non-Resident	80.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Harper Lake Boat Permit - 2 boats/2 years	Non-Resident	140.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Recreation Ctr Sales -- Misc items	Cost plus 40%		Parks/Rec Director		See above
Recreational Vehicle Sanitary Waste Disposal	Resident - per calendar year/per RV	20.00	Public Works Director		See above
Recreational Vehicle Sanitary Waste Disposal	Non-resident - per calendar year/per RV	30.00	Public Works Director		See above
Tennis Courts	Hourly rental per court	5.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Parks & Recreation Special Events Permit		150.00-400.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Recreation Center Admission					
10 Visit Pass	Resident Youth (3-17)	25.00	Parks/Rec Director		Rate/Fee Study
10 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Youth (3-17)	55.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Resident Youth (3-17)	50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Youth (3-17)	110.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
10 Visit Pass	Resident Adult (18-59)	45.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
10 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Adult (18-59)	75.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Resident Adult (18-59)	90.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Adult (18-59)	150.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
10 Visit Pass	Resident Senior 60+	25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
10 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Senior 60+	55.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Resident Senior 60+	50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
20 Visit Pass	Non-Resident Senior 60+	110.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Resident Youth (3-17)	4.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Non-Resident Youth (3-17)	7.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above

Fee Description	Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
Daily Admission	Resident Adult (18-59)	6.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Non-Resident Adult (18-59)	9.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Resident Senior 60+	4.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Non-Resident Senior 60+	7.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Resident Group Rate (10+) Youth	2.50	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Non-Resident Group Rate (10+) Youth	6.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Resident Group Rate (10+) Adults	4.50	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Daily Admission	Non-Resident Group Rate (10+) Adults	8.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Youth (3-17) Resident	19.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Youth (3-17) Non-Resident	29.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Adult (18-59) Resident	35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Adult (18-59) Non-Resident	50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Senior 60+ Resident	19.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Senior 60+ Non-Resident	29.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Couple - Resident	55.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Couple - Non-Resident	70.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Family - Resident	59.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Monthly Pass	Family - Non-Resident	74.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Towel Rental		1.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
LRC Babysitting					
Annual Kids Corner Pass	First child	250.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Annual Kids Corner Pass	Each additional child	50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Drop-in	1 hour	3.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Drop-in	Additional child same family	2.50	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Punch Card	10 hours/40 punches	20.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Other LRC Programs					
American Red Cross CPR & AED	Resident	50.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
American Red Cross CPR & AED	Non-Resident	65.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Aquatics Group Lessons	Resident	49.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Aquatics Group Lessons	Non-Resident	62.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Aquatics Private Lessons	Resident	20.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Aquatics Private Lessons	Non-Resident	25.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Dance		84.00-120.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Fitness Wellness Classes		21.00-240.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Lifeguard training	Resident	35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Lifeguard training	Non-Resident	44.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Nite at the Rec	Resident	12.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Nite at the Rec	Non-Resident	15.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Nite at the REC - Purchase of (4) nights	Resident	36.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Nite at the REC - Purchase of (4) nights	Non-Resident	45.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Senior Activities		5.00-100.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Sports/Adult		28.00-450.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Sports/Youth		30.00-85.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Yoga/ Martial Arts		46.00-75.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Youth Activities		10.00-282.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Coal Creek Golf Course					
Standard Green Fees (may vary for promotions, etc. with approval of Parks and Rec. Dir.)					
	18 hole weekday	34.00 - 46.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	18 hole weekend	35.00 - 52.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	9 hole weekday	20.00 - 28.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	9 hole weekend	21.00 - 23.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	Twilight weekday	32.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	Twilight weekend	35.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
	Annual Membership/Unlimited Golf	1,600.00 - 2,200.00	Parks/Rec Director		See above
Water Tap Fees					

Fee Description	Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
(larger than 4” tap, fee by agreement with City Council)	By Demand in gpm/tap size:				
	0-22 ¾” tap	30,500.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
	23-45 1” tap	54,400.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
	46-80 1½ “ tap	122,000.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
	81-140 2” tap	217,000.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
	141-280 3” tap	488,000.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
	281-500 4” tap	867,500.00	Public Works Director		2016 Tap fee model
Storm Water Permit Fee					
	1 - 5 Acres	300.00	Public Works Director		2017 Community comparison
	6 - 25 Acres	625.00	Public Works Director		2017 Community comparison
	26 - 50 Acres	950.00	Public Works Director		2017 Community comparison
	51 - 100 Acres	1,250.00	Public Works Director		2017 Community comparison
	Above 101 Acres	1,500.00	Public Works Director		2017 Community comparison
Development Review Applications					
	All Fees set forth in Section 17				
Annexation & Zoning	Annexation & initial zoning	6,670.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Annexation & Zoning	Rezoning	3,990.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Wireless Communication Facility	Public review	2,735.00	Planning Director		2018 Decreased to more accurately reflect staff time & overhead for average application. Estimated using PUD fee that would comparable in staff time & resources. No proposed changes.
Wireless Communication Facility	Administrative review	530.00	Planning Director		2017 No proposed changes
Other Land Use Fees	Municipal Code Amendment	500.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Easement or right-of-way vacation	1,840.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Floodplain development permit	470.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Major Demo Permit Review	455.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Minor Demo Permit Review	55.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Variance	745.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Variance – After the fact	1,005.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Minor Impact Variance	80.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Oil & gas production permit	3,325.00	Planning Director		2018 Increased to more accurately reflect staff time & overhead for anticipated legal & other consultant needs to adequately review applications - estimated using PUD fee that would be comparable in staff time & resources.
Other Land Use Fees	1041 Permit	1,325.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Vested Right Request	1,585.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	LP Gas Sales and Exchange	580.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Appeal of Zoning Administrator Decision	730.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Building Code Board of Appeals Appeal Application	730.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Other Land Use Fees	Nonconforming Use Certificate Request	1,830.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Community Zone District	PCZD (≤ 100 acres)	5,135.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Community Zone District	PCZD (> 100 acres)	5,785.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Community Zone District	PCZD amendment	1,830.00	Planning Director		2018 Increased to more accuratley reflect staff time & overhead for anticipated legal & other consultant needs to adequately review applications - estimated using PUD fee that would be comparable in staff time & resources.
Planned Unit Development	PUD – preliminary review (< 7 acres)	2,735.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Unit Development	PUD – final review (≤ 7 acres)	2,735.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Unit Development	PUD – preliminary review (> 7 acres)	3,325.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Unit Development	PUD – final review (> 7 acres)	2,735.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Unit Development	PUD – amendment	1,830.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Planned Unit Development	Administrative PUD amendment	530.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Special Review Use	Special Review Use (SRU)	1,210.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Special Review Use	SRU amendment	1,000.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Special Review Use	SRU (use only, no development)	500.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Special Review Use	SRU administrative amendment	345.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Special Review Use	Day Care (Neighborhood 6 – 12 children)	355.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Subdivision	Preliminary plat (≤ 15 acres)	1,340.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Subdivision	Preliminary plat (> 15 acres)	3,400.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Subdivision	Final plat (all) & Final agreement(s) (with final PUD)	1,060.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Subdivision	Final plat (not accompanied by a PUD)	1,895.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Subdivision	Minor subdivision	1,895.00	Planning Director		2017 Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.

Fee Description	Detail	Fee	Responsible Party	Date Last Revised	Comments (How Determined & Proposed Changes)
Temporary Uses	Temporary use permit (administrative)	190.00	Planning Director	2017	Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Temporary Uses	Temporary use permit (public review)	335.00	Planning Director	2017	Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Temporary Uses	Temporary sign permit	95.00	Planning Director	2017	Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Zoning Code Amendment		555.00	Planning Director	2017	Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Zoning Map Amendment		565.00	Planning Director	2017	Updated for inflation. No proposed changes.
Revocable License Agreements					
	Staff/Attorney Fees	TBD	City Manager		Determined by City Attorney
	Fees may be charged to recoup city costs, including city attorney fees		City Manager		
Public Works					
Temporary Easements	Construction, Slope, etc.	10.00	Public Works Director	2017	Community comparison
IPP Sampling Fees	Cost for sampling Industrial Users - Market Value	TBD	Public Works Director	2017	Current commercial lab rates
Utility Fees					
Re-use Water Fee		75% of Residential Rate	Public Works Director	2018	Financial model
Account Delinquent Fee	Charged when bill is 30 days past due	\$5.00 + 1%/Month	Finance Director		This fee is set to recover the cost of providing the service. No change is currently being proposed.
Final Bill/Transfer Fee	Covers cost of final reading, final billing and transfer account. Charged to seller when property is sold	25.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	1 st occurrence		Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	Normal business hours	25.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	After hours	50.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	2 nd occurrence		Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	Normal business hours	50.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	After hours	75.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	Subsequent occurrences		Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	Normal business hours	75.00	Finance Director		See above
Reconnect Fee for Utilities	After hours	100.00	Finance Director		See above
Red Tag Fee (Delinquency Notice)	Fee for hanging notice at time account is 30 days past due	15.00	Finance Director		See above
Service Fee for rejected payment		25.00	Finance Director		See above
Voluntary Disconnect & Reconnect Fee	Per disconnect and per reconnect	25.00	Finance Director		See above
Approved:					
Heather Balser, City Manager					

City of Louisville, Colorado
Calculation of Miscellaneous Fee Inflator

	Wages	Benefits	Supplies	Services	Total
Average Target (2019-2024)	4.91%	5.98%	3.09%	4.01%	
Average Amount (2019-2024)	18,066,300	31,067,100	2,217,000	13,527,200	64,877,600
Percent of Total	27.85%	47.89%	3.42%	20.85%	100.00%
Target X Percent of Total	0.0136728	0.0286357	0.0010559	0.0083610	5.17%

SUBJECT: CITY PROGRAMS, GOALS & KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

DATE: JUNE 15, 2018

**PRESENTED BY: EMILY HOGAN, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER
HEATHER BALSER, CITY MANAGER**

SUMMARY:

In 2016 City Council adopted the City's first program-based budget in which revenues and expenditures were organized by programs and services. The budget was structured into 10 Program areas and 38 Sub-Programs to make it easier for the public to understand where the City invests their taxes and fees to provide services and for Council to evaluate how efficiently and effectively the City uses those resources to achieve the objectives of each Sub-Program. The 10 Programs and 38 Sub-Programs are as follows:

- Transportation – Planning & Engineering, Transportation Infrastructure Maintenance, Streetscapes, Snow & Ice Removal
- Utilities – Water, Wastewater, Stormwater, Solid Waste, Recycling & Composting
- Public Safety & Justice – Patrol & Investigation, Code Enforcement, Municipal Court
- Parks – Parks, Cemetery
- Open Space & Trails – Acquisition, Maintenance & Management, Education & Outreach, Trail Maintenance, New Trails
- Recreation – Youth Activities, Adult Activities, Senior Activities & Services, Aquatics, Golf Course
- Cultural Services – Library Services, Museum Services, Cultural Arts & Special Events
- Community Design – Community Design, Development Review, Historic Preservation
- Economic Prosperity – Business Retention & Development
- Administration & Support Services – Governance & Administration, Public Information & Involvement, City Clerk & Public Records, Legal Support, Human Resources & Organizational Development, Finance, Accounting & Tax Administration, Information Technology, Sustainability

Progress toward the objectives of each Sub-Program is measured by Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). 38 KPIs were developed for the City's Sub-Programs with the following elements:

SUBJECT: CITY PROGRAMS, GOALS & KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**DATE: JUNE 15, 2018****PAGE 2 OF 2**

- Goals and objectives that clearly reflect what is intended to be achieved through all Program and Sub-Program activities.
- Workload measures that show the quantity or volume of products, services, or efforts involved.
- Efficiency measures that demonstrate the resources used to accomplish a measureable outcome, level of productivity and/or cost per unit of output.
- Effectiveness measures that indicate how well a program is accomplishing the stated goals and objectives. They often measure the results, accomplishments or quality of the products or services provided.

Council and staff review the Programs and Sub-Programs during the biennial budget process to ensure that they represent the City's priorities. The KPIs are also reviewed to determine if the goals and objectives accurately represent the City's activities and if there are different measures (i.e. measures that provide better data or can be automated) that should be used to evaluate progress in accomplishing those goals and objectives.

The Finance Committee reviewed the Programs, goals and KPIs in March, April and May and suggested edits, which have been incorporated in the attached redline KPIs. Council also reviewed the Programs, goals and KPIs on May 1st and made additional edits, which have been included in the redline KPIs. After the Programs, goals and KPIs for 2019/2020 are finalized, staff will begin the process of collecting data, which will be due in August.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM IMPACT:

One of the objectives for the Governance and Administration Sub-Program is monitoring and managing service delivery to maintain effectiveness and efficiency. Reviewing the KPIs annually ensures that the City is using measures that provide useful information in regards to efficiency and effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION:

Discussion and direction of the City's Programs/Sub-Programs and their goals and objectives and the KPIs.

ATTACHMENT(S):

Redline Key Performance Indicators

Administration & Support Services Key Indicators City Clerk/Public Records Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide efficient and transparent processes for residents to access public documents and notice of public hearings/events. Transparent, consistent and responsive management of the licensing authority and special events permits.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Public Information Requests Filled		Requests				
City Council Agenda Items ¹		Items				
Board & Commission Applications Processed		Items				
Special Event Permits Processed		Items				
Open Government Trainings Offered		Units				
Pages added to Records Archive		Pages				
Efficiency						
Open Government Training Cost per Attendee		Cost/Attendee				
Agenda Item Review & Packet Production Time²		Minutes per Item				
Ave. Special Event Permit Processing Time ³		Hours per Permit				
Effectiveness						
Overall Rating of Business License Program Customer Service Survey Results ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Overall Rating of Dog License Program⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
Meeting Minutes are Accurate⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
Meeting Minutes are Completed within Deadline⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
¹ Includes regular City Council meetings, Special City Council Meetings, and Study Sessions. ² Includes agenda and item preparation, City Manager item review, and packet production. ³ Time for Clerk's Office, Parks, Operations, Police for permit review and processing. ⁴ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.						

Administration & Support Services Key Indicators Facility Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide and manage facilities that maintain efficient and effective operations and promote environmental and economic sustainability.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
City Facilities Managed		#				
Efficiency						
BTUs/Gross Square Foot for City Hall		BTU/GSF				
BTUs/Gross Square Foot for City Services		BTU/GSF				
BTUs/Gross Square Foot for Library		BTU/GSF				
BTUs/Gross Square Foot for Recreation/Senior Center		BTU/GSF				
BTUs/Gross Square Foot for Police/Court		BTU/GSF				
City Hall Water Usage		Gallons				
City Services Water Usage		Gallons				
Library Water Usage		Gallons				
Recreation/Senior Center Water Usage		Gallons				
Police/Court Water Usage		Gallons				
Annual City Fleet Fuel Consumption		Gallons				
City Energy Upgrade Cost Savings		\$ Saved				
Effectiveness						
City Facility GHG Emissions	Target =	GHG				

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators

Finance, Accounting & Tax Administration Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide financial services in an efficient and effective manner and financial reporting that is accurate, timely, relevant, and transparent. Develop, maintain, and monitor financial policies and internal controls to ensure the safeguarding of public assets and organizational compliance with laws, regulations, and Council directives. Provide an efficient, effective, and transparent budget developing, reporting, and monitoring process. Provide other financial services, such as long-term financial planning, debt administration, cash and investment management, cash disbursements, cash collections, and front counter services. Efficiently and effectively provide all financial and accounting services as required by the City, including all accounting and financial reporting. Maintain financial policies and internal controls to ensure organizational compliance with laws and regulations. Ensure accurate and timely budget development, implementation, and monitoring. Provide long-term financial planning, debt administration, cash and investment management, cash disbursements, cash receipts, and front counter operations.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 PROJECTED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Journal Entries Posted		Entries				
Accounts Payable & P-Card Transactions		Transactions				
Receipts Processed		Transactions				
Sales & Use Tax Returns Processed		Returns				
Payroll Checks & NOD's Processed		Transactions				
Utility Bills Processed		Billings				
Combined Utility Revenue Collected		Dollars				
Average Cash & Investment Balance and Rate of Return ¹	Average \$'s					
	Rate of Return					
Efficiency						
Direct Op Cost to Process One PR Trans		Cost/Trans (\$'s)				
Direct Op Cost to Process One AP Trans		Cost/Trans (\$'s)				
Direct Op Cost to Process One Utility Bill		Cost/Bill (\$'s)				
Effectiveness						
Unmodified Audit Opinion	<u>Target =</u>	Yes/No				
GFOA CAFR and Budget Awards	<u>Target =</u>	Yes/No				
Revenue Forecast Accuracy ²	<u>Target =</u>	Accuracy				

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Finance, Accounting & Tax Administration Sub-Program

Sales & Use Tax Audit Evaluation Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Sales/Use Tax Training Evaluation Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

¹ Excludes URA bond proceeds.

² Excludes interfund transfers.

³ Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each audit and each training program with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators Governance & Administration Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Governance based on thorough understanding of the community's diverse interests executed through clear and effective policy direction. Administration that supports informed policy making, ensures the City has the financial capacity to sustain Council adopted levels of service, monitors and manages service delivery to maintain effectiveness and efficiency, and promotes a healthy organizational culture.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Public Meetings ¹		Meetings				
City Council Agenda Items		Items				
City Council Requests ²		Items				
<u>Total All Funds Budget</u>		\$				
Efficiency						
<u>Average Meeting Time per Regular Agenda Issue</u>		Minutes/Issue				
\$ per Capita		Program \$				
		Sub-Program \$				
<u>% of Total All Funds Budget</u>		Program %				
		Sub-Program %				
Avg. Days to Respond to City Council Request		Days				
Effectiveness						
Bond Rating	<u>Target =</u>	S&P Rating				
"Overall Performance of Louisville City government" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5</u>				
"Quality of Services Provided by City" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				
"City Operates by Strong Values and Ethics" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				
"City is Going in the Right Direction" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				
"We do Things Efficiently and Well" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				
<u>City Employee Satisfaction with Leadership</u> ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				

¹ City Council regular meetings and study sessions.

² Items submitted for staff follow-up through City Council request tracking system.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
3	Based on evaluation survey rating from City Council, City Manager & Planning Commission with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.				
4	Based on most recent Employee Survey results.				

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators Human Resources & Organizational Development Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Be an employer of choice, with low employee turnover and high morale. Attract and retain highly qualified and dedicated employees by providing competitive compensation and benefits, effective employee training, and ongoing career and professional development opportunities. Maintain a positive work environment through regular position classification and review, workforce planning, salary administration and employee relations. Maintain a safe workplace through employee safety training.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Citywide FTEs		FTE Positions				
Citywide Employees (Full & Part Time)		Active Employees				
Recruiting/Hiring/Screening (Vacant Positions Filled)		Positions				
Applications Reviewed		Applications				
Training Classes Offered to Employees		Classes				
Personnel Actions (PA) processed		PAs				
Employee Relations Cases ¹		Cases				
Volunteer Backgrounds and Verifications of Employment processed		Number Completed				
<u>Unemployment Claims</u>		<u>Number Processed</u>				
Efficiency						
\$ Per FTE (Benefits) ²		\$				
Average Time Between Position Closed & Offer Made ³		Calendar Days				
HR FTE per Citywide FTE		HR FTE/City FTE				
HR Budget/General Fund Expenditures ⁴		%/General Fund				
Effectiveness						
<u>City Employee Satisfaction with Climate⁵</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
Employee Turnover	<u>Target =</u>	% Turnover among FTEs				
Performance Appraisals Completed on Schedule	<u>Target =</u>	% Completed within 30 Days of Due Date				
Satisfaction Rating for Training Classes Offered ^{6,5}	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workers Compensation Rating	<u>Target =</u>	Experience Mod				
¹ Case defined as coaching opportunity or situation that requires extended follow-up (more than one hour) and assistance from Human Resources for resolution. ² Reduction from 2015 to 2016 was due to a decrease in premium, not benefits. This indicates cost of Health, Dental, and Vision benefits. ³ Time to fill benefitted full-time vacancy when position is open for 14 days (data based on date position was closed until date position is offered to the candidate.) ⁴ Includes General Fund Expenditures less Interfund Transfers, Total= \$16,924,445 (2016), \$19,314,425 (2017), \$20,190,610 (2018). ⁵ <u>Based on most recent Employee Survey results.</u> ⁶ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.						

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators Information Technology Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Maintain a secure and connected network ensuring all users have appropriate technological resources to effectively perform their jobs. Provide outstanding internal customer service to efficiently resolve employee help desk issues.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
IT FTEs		FTE Positions				
Citywide FTEs		FTE Positions				
Workload						
Data Networks Supported		Items				
Enterprise Devices Supported		Items				
Servers Supported		Items				
Workstations Supported		Items				
Total Help Desk Tickets		Items				
Enterprise Applications Supported		Items				
Efficiency						
IT Expense per FTE		Expense/FTE				
IT Budget/General Fund Expenditures ¹		%/General Fund				
Average Expenditures Per Workstation		\$/Workstation				
Effectiveness						
IT-to-City Staff FTE Ratio	Target =	% of FTE				
Infrastructure Availability	Target =	% of Time				
Performance Rating on Internal Survey ²	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				
% RUN Operations (Standard 80%)	Target =	%				
% GROW Operations (Standard 15%)	Target =	%				
% TRANSFORM Operations (Std 5%)	Target =	%				

¹ Includes General Fund Expenditures less Interfund Transfers, Total= \$16,924,445 (2016), \$19,314,425 (2017), \$20,190,610 (2018).

² Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators

Legal Support Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration and support.

Objectives

Effective, cost efficient and responsive legal advice for City Council, Management, and staff in legal matters pertaining to their official powers and duties. Represent the City in all legal proceedings, finalize all legal documents for the City.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
City Legal Work ¹		Hours				
Water Attorney Legal Work		Hours				
Urban Renewal Legal Work		Hours				
Legal Memorandums		Items				
Legislation Drafted²		Items				
Education/Trainings Offered ²		Units				
Documents Prepared or Reviewed⁴		Items				
Efficiency						
Ave Time to Process Contracts		Days/Contract				
City Legal Work \$/Year		\$				
Water Legal Work \$/Year		\$				
Urban Renewal Work \$/Year		\$				
Effectiveness						
Customer Service Survey Results ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

¹ Includes formal and informal legal opinions or interpretations, research, and litigation by the City Attorney.

² Open government trainings also included in City Clerk/Public Records Sub-Program.

³ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service from Council & staff with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators Public Information & Involvement Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Easy and timely access to all relevant information about City programs and services. Processes that give anyone interested opportunities to get involved and influence decision making.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Newsletters Produced		Units				
Meetings Broadcast on Channel 8/ Streaming Online ¹		Units				
Public/Media Citizen Inquiries ^{2&3}		Items				
Website Content Updates Monthly		Updates/Month				
Social Media Posts ²⁴		Items				
Topics Questions Posted on Engage Louisville		Items				
Press Releases Issued		#				
Community Workshops ³		#				
Efficiency						
Ave. Response Time/ Citizen Inquiry		Days/ Inquiry				
Cost to Produce Newsletter per Capita		\$				
Residents Who Speak at City Council Regular Meetings ⁵		Attendees				
Effectiveness						
Website Enotification Subscribers	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Subscribers</u>				
Residents Subscribed to E-Newsletter		Subscribers				
Website Visitors	<u>Target =</u>	Visitors				
Social Media Followers ²	<u>Target =</u>	Followers				
Engage Louisville Users	<u>Target =</u>	Users				
Attendees per Community Workshop	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Attendees</u>				
"Opportunities to Participate in Community Matters" Rating ⁴³	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				
"Information about City Council, Planning	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good</u>				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Commission and Other Official City Meetings” Rating ⁴³						
“Louisville Website” Rating ⁵³	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5				
“Information about City Plans and Programs” Rating ⁴³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good				
¹ Includes City Council, Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission Meetings. ² Includes City of Louisville’s Facebook and Twitter followers. ³ <u>Workshops not related to Community Design.</u> ⁴³ <u>Based on evaluation survey rating provided at community workshops with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.</u> ⁵ <u>Based on evaluation survey from website with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.</u>						

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators Sustainability Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Use environmental, economic, and human resources to meet present and future needs without compromising the ecosystems on which we depend. Actively pursue energy efficient upgrades to realize cost savings and reduce environmental impacts.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Sustainability Programs <u>Events and Programs¹</u>		#				
Waste Generation and Diversion <u>Sustainability Communications²</u>		Items				
Efficiency						
<u>Average Cost per Sustainability Event</u>		\$/Event				
Annual Consumption <u>Gallons</u>						
Effectiveness						
Residential Waste Diversion	<u>Target =</u>	%				
Commercial Waste Diversion	<u>Target =</u>	%				
Community GHG Emissions	<u>Target =</u>	GHG				
Community Energy Use/per Capita (Electricity) ³⁶	<u>Target =</u>	kWh/Capita				
Water Use/per Capita	<u>Target =</u>	Gallons/Capita				
“Encouraging Sustainability for Both Residential and Commercial Properties” Rating ⁴⁷	<u>Target =</u>	% Essential or Important				
<u>City Facility Water Usage⁷</u>		<u>Gallons</u>				
<u>City Fleet Fuel Usage</u>		<u>Avg \$ / Fleet Vehicle</u>				
<u>BTUs/Gross Square Foot⁸</u>		<u>BTU/GSF</u>				
<u>Cost Savings from Energy Upgrades⁴</u>		<u>\$ Saved</u>				

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
¹ Includes all identified Outreach and Engagement events and programs (i.e. Sustainability Series, Green Business Program, Partners in Energy, zero waste events, etc.) ² Communications includes but is not limited to: direct email, website updating, press releases, evaluation surveys, etc. ³ Energy savings for projects during current year. ⁴ Includes five largest City facilities: City Hall, City Services, Library, Police & Court, Recreation & Senior Center. ⁵ Based on estimated GHG emissions from community energy use. ⁶ Based on most recent Xcel Community Energy Report (Residential kWh from Xcel energy/population = kWh per capita). ⁷ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.					

Community Design Program Key Indicators Community Design Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere, effective and efficient building services and effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system.

Objectives

A well-connected and safe community that is easy for all people to walk, bike, or drive in. Neighborhoods that are rated highly by residents and thriving commercial areas. An open and inclusive long-range planning process with significant public participation.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Municipal Code Amendments		# Processed				
Long Rang Plan Projects		# Worked On				
Long-Range Planning Projects (Area Plans, Neighborhood Plans, etc.)		Hours (Estimates)				
Community Open Houses/Meetings		Events				
Efficiency						
Direct Cost per Code Amendment		\$/ Amendment				
<u>Subprogram Expenditures per \$/Long-Range Plan or Study</u>		\$/Plan				
<u>Hours per Completed Plan¹</u>		<u>Hours/Plan</u>				
<u>Staff Hours per Open House/Meetings</u>		<u>Hours/Event</u>				
<u>Number of Subscribers on Engage Louisville for Community Design Related Projects/Cost</u>		<u># of Comments/\$</u>				
Effectiveness						
New Development Audit Rating ¹	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
"Overall Performance of the Louisville Planning Department" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5</u>				
"The Public Input Process on City Planning Issues" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5 % Excellent or Good</u>				
"Sense of Community" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5 % Excellent or Good</u>				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
"Overall Image or Reputation of Louisville" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5%</u> Excellent or Good				
"Ease of Walking in Louisville" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5%</u> Excellent or Good				
<u>Number of Subscribers on Engage Louisville for Community Design Related Projects</u>		#				
¹ Annual audit of how well developments satisfy design criteria. 1-5 rating, with 1 not meeting standard and has negative effect, 2 not meeting standard, 3 meets standard, 4 slightly exceeds standard and 5 greatly exceeds standard. ² <u>Based on evaluation survey rating from City Council & Planning Commission with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.</u>						

Community Design Program Key Indicators Development Review Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere, effective and efficient building services and effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system

Objectives

Review development applications and enforce the building, zoning and subdivision laws of the city to promote public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, general welfare and consumer protection.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Pre-Application Conferences		# Held				
Development Review Applications (PUD, SRU, Plats, etc.)		# Processed				
Administrative Reviews/Amendments		# Processed				
Building Permits Processed		# Processed				
Building Inspections Completed		# Completed				
Efficiency						
Direct Cost Subprogram Expenditure per Development Application		\$/Application				
Direct Cost Subprogram Expenditure per Building Permit Review		\$/Permit				
Direct Cost Subprogram Expenditure per Inspection		\$/Inspect				
Building Permit Review Time		Ave Review Time				
Development Review Time		Ave Review Time				
Effectiveness						
Building Inspection Rollovers ¹	<u>Target =</u>	Ave./Month				
Customer Service and Program Rating ^{2,1}	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
"Planning Review Process for New Development" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5				
"Building Permit Process" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5 % Excellent or Good				
"Building/Construction Inspection Process" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5 % Excellent or Good				
¹ Rollover is when there is not enough staffing to complete all scheduled inspections for the day and inspections rollover to the following business day. Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. ² Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.						

Community Design Program Key Indicators Historic Preservation Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere, effective and efficient building services and effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system.

Objectives

Provide incentives to preserve the historic character of old town to encourage the promotion and preservation of Louisville's history and cultural heritage. Provide incentives and processes to preserve historic buildings.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Historic Preservation Commission & Subcommittee Application Public Hearings Reviews		# Processed				
Subcommittee Reviews		# Processed				
Administrative Reviews/Determinations		# Processed				
Social Histories Reports		# Reports				
Outreach Events		# of Events				
Special Projects (Preservation Master Plan, Historic Context Studies, etc.)		Hours				
Efficiency						
Direct Cost per HPC Applications Processed		\$/# Processed				
Direct Cost per Historic Preservation Administrative Review		\$/# Processed # Processed/ FTE				
Public Hearing Application Review Time to HPC Number of applications not reviewed at next HPC meeting after application is made		Average Review Time# of applications				
Demolition Subcommittee Review Time		Average Review Time				
Administrative Demolition Application Review Time		Average Review Time				
Ratio of Grant Funds Awarded to Administrative Costs ¹		% Grants to Admin Costs				
Effectiveness						
Landmarked Structures	Target =	# per Year				
Historic Structure Assessments Grants (HSA) Resulting in Landmarking ¹	Target =	% Approved to Completed% resulting in Landmarking				
Grants/Loans Approved	Target =	\$				
Engagement at Outreach Events	Target =	Total # of Participants				
Zoning Incentives	Target =	# Permits Using Bonuses				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Demolition Stays Resulting in Preservation ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Resulting in Preservation				
¹ Grant applications are voluntary. At times the City needs more outreach (admin costs) to get residents/businesses to apply for grants. Administrative time can be used on other projects.						

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators Cultural Arts & Special Events Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage. Continue City sponsored events.

Objectives

High-quality, diverse community-wide special events, public art, cultural arts programming for residents of and visitors to Louisville. Provide facilities for community cultural arts programming.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Cultural Council Events Managed		Events				
Collaboration with Other Arts Organizations Rental Contracts Managed		<u>Contracts</u>				
Marketing Materials Produced ¹		Items				
Vendor Contracts Managed		Items				
<u>City Special Events Managed²</u>		<u>Events</u>				
Public Art <u>Pieces Managed³²</u>		Pieces				
Efficiency						
\$ per Event		Street Faire				
		July 4th				
		Fall Festival				
		LCC Events				
Marketing Impressions/Material Produced		<u>Impressions</u>				
Marketing <u>Cost Materials \$Hours</u> /Attendee		Cost/Attendee				
Staff <u>Hours</u> /Volunteer Hours		Hours/Hours				
<u>Downtown Flowers</u>		\$				
<u>Holiday Lights</u>		\$				
Effectiveness						
"Opportunities to Participate in Special Events and Community Activities" Rating ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
Fall Festival	<u>Target =</u>	Attendees				
4 th of July Fireworks	<u>Target =</u>	Viewers <u>Attendees</u>				
LCC Events ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Attendees/ Capacity <u>Event</u>				
Street Faire ⁶	<u>Target =</u>	Attendees				
Average Rating of Programs ⁷⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Total LCC Revenue of Tickets Sold	<u>Target =</u>	\$				
<u>Steinbaugh Pavilion Utilization</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Days Arts Use/Available Days</u>				
Arts Center Utilization	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Days of Arts Use/Available Days</u>				
¹ Includes posters, e-newsletters, paid advertisements, handbills, radio ad copy, social media posts and press releases. ² Includes each individual City special event managed including: 4 th of July Fireworks, Labor Day Parade, Pet Parade, Fall Festival, Senior Dinner, and one-time City special events such as ribbon cuttings and grand openings. ³ Number of public artwork pieces under the care of the City and available for public viewing on an ongoing or rotating basis. ⁴ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. ⁵ <u>Maximum capacity for the Louisville Center for the Arts is 105.</u> ⁶ <u>Total for all Street Faire nights.</u> ⁷ <u>Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.</u>						

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators Library Services Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage.

Objectives

Provide information and technology to all members of the community, with assistance from an approachable, knowledgeable staff. Foster lifelong learning by delivering wide-ranging, hands-on learning activities and programs to all ages. Practice and reinforce the skills needed for reading readiness with young children so that they are poised to be successful learners when they enter school.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018* ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload					
Check-outs and Renewals ¹	Items				
<u>Check-outs and Renewals for Louisville Items only</u>	<u>Items</u>				
Library Card Holders	Resident Library Card				
Programs for Adults, Teens, and Children ²	# of Programs				
Programs for Adults, Teens, and Children²	Attendance				
Ave Number of WiFi Users	Daily				
Visitors	Annual				
Efficiency					
Check-outs per FTE	Items/FTE				
Program Attendance per 1,000 Served ³	Units				
Summer Reading Program Participation (Age 11 and Under)	Total Registrants				
<u>Annual Library Website Page Views</u>	<u>Total Page Views</u>				
Study Rooms Booked	Ave.% Open Hours				
Ave Time from Item Check-in to Back on Shelf	Hours				
Ave. Days for Newly Acquired Items to be Ready for Checkout	Days				
Effectiveness					
<u>Programs for Adults, Teens, and Children⁴</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Total Attendance</u>			
"Overall Performance of Louisville Public Library" Rating ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5			
"Louisville Public Library Programs" Rating ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or Good			
"Services at the Louisville Public	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5% Excellent or			

Library” Rating ⁵		Good				
“Louisville Public Library Services Online” Rating ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5%- Excellent or- Good</u>				
<u>“Summer Reading Program Motivated Kids to Read More”⁵</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
<u>“Adult and Teen Programs Rated Good or Excellent”⁵</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
¹ Includes Louisville items and other consortium items checked out. ² Staff-created and hosted programs. ³ Statewide average for municipal libraries serving 25,000-100,000 is 543. (Source: Library Research Service). ⁴ Statewide average for municipal libraries serving 25,000-100,000 is 16,667. (Source: Library Research Service). ⁵ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. ⁵⁶ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. * Library closed for remodel April 8-15, 2018.						

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators Museum Services Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage.

Objectives

Promote, collect, preserve, and interpret the history of Louisville, with emphasis on the coal mining period from 1877-1955. Make historical artifacts and documents accessible both physically and virtually. Educate children and adults about Louisville's past through programs, displays, and publications.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Total Collection Size ¹		Items				
Total Items Cataloged		Items				
Programs and Outreach Offered		Programs Offered				
Efficiency						
Attendance to Resident Ratio		Att./Population				
<u>Staff Time per Item Acquired</u>		<u>Hours</u>				
Average Attendance per Program		Att./Program				
Effectiveness						
"Overall Performance of the Louisville Historical Museum" ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5</u>				
"Louisville Historical Museum Programs" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5</u>				
"Louisville Historical Museum Campus" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Excellent or Good Rating 1 to 5</u>				
Visitors	<u>Target =</u>	Annual				
Program and Outreach Attendance ³	<u>Target =</u>	Attendance				
Web Access Users (Site Visits)	<u>Target =</u>	Total Site Visits				
Historic Photos and Documents Catalogued and Accessible (Total) ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	Items				
<u>Staff Time per Item Acquired</u>		<u>Hours</u>				
History Foundation	<u>Target =</u>	Members				
Percent of Residents Who are Members	<u>Target =</u>	% of Total				

¹ Includes digitized images.

² Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

³ New programming added including First Friday Art Walk open houses.

⁴ Not all photos that the Museum has in its collection and digitizes may legally be made accessible online.

⁵ The families represented by family memberships are assumed to consist of an average of three people.

Economic Prosperity Program Key Indicators Business Retention and Development Sub-Program

Goals

Promote a thriving business climate that provides job opportunities, facilitates investment, and produces reliable revenue to support City services.

Objectives

Maintain positive business relationships throughout the community and assist property owners, brokers, and companies in finding locations and/ or constructing new buildings in the City. Attract and retain a diverse mix of businesses that provide good employment opportunities for Louisville residents.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Licensed Businesses ¹		Units				
Workload						
BAP Agreements Negotiated		Units				
Meetings Facilitated		Units				
Retention Visits		Units				
Lease Management (Old City Shops, Koko Plaza)		Items				
Efficiency						
Construction Dollars per BAP Incentive		\$				
Incentives per Job Added		\$				
Annual Sales Tax \$ per \$1.00 BAP Incentive		\$				
Effectiveness						
New Annual Sales Tax Revenue Sales Tax \$/Capita	<u>Target =</u>	\$				
Total Number of Louisville Employees	<u>Target =</u>	#				
Median Household Income²	<u>Target =</u>	\$				
Investment in Louisville Commercial Property³	<u>Target =</u>	\$				
Vacancy Rates ³	<u>Target =</u>	Office				
		Retail				
		Industrial				

¹ Sales & use tax accounts.

² ~~Year-over-year change of total sales tax revenue.~~

³ ~~Change in Louisville jobs based upon the State of Colorado's Quarterly Census of Employment Wages (QCEW) from previous year.~~

²⁴ U.S. Census figure for the City of Louisville.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
³⁵ Based upon noted value of commercial building permits.					

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators Acquisition Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

Maintain an up to date list of high-priority candidate parcels for acquisition. Contact each property owner and, based on the owner's expressed interests, determine the most effective strategy for voluntary acquisition of or easement on each candidate parcel. Maintain contact with each property owner consistent with their expressed interests. Voluntarily acquire candidate parcels at a price that reflects the current market value for comparable property (considering all development restrictions, size, location, existing development, and other relevant factors). Maintain funding for acquisition consistent with adopted Council policy.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
OSAB Ranked & Council Reviewed Candidate Parcel ¹		Units				
Property Owners Contacted		Contacts				
Efficiency						
Number of Properties Actively Worked on		Units				
Effectiveness						
Candidate List is Up-to-Date	<u>Target =</u>	Annual Review				
Rights of First Refusal Secured	<u>Target =</u>	Rights				
Conservation Easements Secured	<u>Target =</u>	Units				
¹ OSAB has ranked and Approved.						

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators Education and Outreach Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation

Objectives

To inform and educate residents and visitors about the City's diverse Open Space properties and the many benefits associated with these lands. To involve residents and visitors in activities that encourage understanding and stewardship of these lands.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Education Programs		# of Programs				
Volunteer Programs ¹		# of Programs				
Efficiency						
Average Participants per Education Program ²		Participants/ Program				
Total Hours Donated to Volunteer Programs		Hours				
Effectiveness						
Average Overall Rating of Education Programs ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Average Overall Rating of Volunteer Programs ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Better Understanding of Open Space Attributes ³	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
¹ Volunteer programs include: Adopts, OSAB, Weed Whackers, Raptor Monitors, Burrowing Owls, Photo Points, and Group Projects (each individual group project). ² This is the true average that includes highly attended education programs (i.e. school assemblies (210 & 131), CSU weed tour (175)). When high-attended programs are subtracted from tally the average is 12. ³ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service following each program with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.						

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators Maintenance and Management Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

Manage the City's Open Space properties in a manner consistent with good stewardship and sound ecological principles that benefits citizens of Louisville by promoting native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
City Owned Open Space Acreage		Acres				
Open Space Expenditures ¹		Total Exp				
Hours of Weed Control (Chemical) ²		Hours				
Hours of Weed Control (Mechanical) ^{2 & 3}		Hours				
Contracts Managed Annually		Contracts				
Ranger Naturalist Enforcement Contacts with Users <u>for Dog Off-Leash</u>		Citations or Penalty Assessment/Written Warnings/Verbal Warnings				
Efficiency						
Open Space Expenditures per Acre		Exp./Acres				
<u>Open Space Expenditures per Capita</u>		<u>Exp./Capita</u>				
\$ per Acre of Weed Control ⁴		\$/Acre				
Colorado "A-List" Species <u>Purple Loosestrife</u> Treated		% Treated				
<u>Myrtle Spurge Treated</u>		<u>% Treated</u>				
Effectiveness						
"Maintenance of Open Space" Rating ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good <u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
<u>Dogs Off-Leash Over Time</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>#</u>				
% of Acreage Free of High Priority Weeds	<u>Target =</u>	% of Total				
% of all Open Space Zoned	<u>Target =</u>	% of Total <u>Zoned Agricultural</u>				
		% of Total Zoned <u>Preservation</u>				
		% of Total Zoned <u>Recreational</u>				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Percentage of all Open Space Designated		% of Total				
¹ Expense for the Admin & Operations Sub Program. ² Includes contractor, staff, and volunteer effort. ³ Includes hours provided by goat grazing (336 hrs). Grazing hour calculated by herd not per goat. ⁴ Contractual only. 2017 is the average of both the herbicide contracts (\$1,210.50/acre) & goat grazing contract (\$2,500/acre). In addition, more acreage was back pack sprayed in 2017 which made the cost (labor) of herbicide spraying more expensive in 2017. ⁵ Based on annual OSAB review with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.						

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators

New Trails and Trail Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

Construct the highest priority new trails and trail connections to enhance the trail system in a manner consistent with City Council adopted plans. Maintain all trails to a satisfactory level to encourage recreation and to enable safe walking, running and bike riding around Louisville.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Public Meetings for New Trails		Meetings				
Length of New Trails ¹		Feet Miles				
Number of New Trail Connections		Connections				
<u>Trails – Total Miles in Open Space</u>		Miles				
<u>Trails – Soft Surface in Open Space</u>		Miles				
<u>Trails – Hard Surface in Open Space</u>		Miles				
Efficiency						
\$ per square Mile Foot ²		\$/ Foot Mile				
<u>Sub-Program Cost per Mile</u>		\$/Mile				
<u>Time to Resolve Reported User Safety Maintenance Item</u>		Days				
<u>Total Number of Wayfinding Signs</u>		Units				
Effectiveness						
Number of Trail Connections and Crossings Remaining to be Completed ¹	<u>Target =</u>	Total				
<u>“Maintenance of the Trail System” Rating³</u>	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
<u>Number of Dog Composting Bag Refills</u>	<u>Target =</u>	#				
<u>Trash Containers Rating⁴</u>	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
<u>Maintenance Rating⁴</u>	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5 in Spring				
		Rating 1 to 5 in Fall				

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
¹ Includes trails identified in the “New Trails” and “Wayfinding” CIP’s. ² Includes construction costs only (not design) for segments actually built in a particular year. ³ <u>Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.</u> ⁴ <u>Based on annual OSAB review with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Below Average, 1=Poor</u>					

Parks Program Key Indicators Cemetery Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visit of see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained; and a final resting place that meets community needs

Objectives

Provide a suitable final resting place that meets community needs.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Total Acreage		Acres				
Plots-Occupied ¹		Plots				
Plots-Vacant ²		Plots				
Plots Sold		Plots				
Efficiency						
Cost to Inter (Adult Size) ³		Ave \$/Per				
Cost to Inter (Cremation) ³		Ave \$/Per				
Cost per Plot ⁴		Ave \$/Plot				
Acreage Maintained/FTE		Acres/FTE				
Effectiveness						
PPLAB Rating ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Projected Supply of Plots Relative to Demand ⁶	<u>Target =</u>	Years of Supply				

¹ Number was reached by a survey estimate.

² There are approximately 5,200 plots in the cemetery comprised of full-size, infant and cremation. The numbers reflect plots that are not interred.

³ Cost for opening and closing may increase due to Saturday burial, less than 48 hour notice and vault pricing.

⁴ Cost shown is for a resident rate full-size plot. Different rates exist for resident and non-residents for: full-size, infant and cremation plot sizes.

⁵ Based on annual PPLAB review of each trail segment with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

⁶ Estimate is based on full-size plot size. Cremation plot supply will run out quicker.

Parks Program Key Indicators Parks Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visits or see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained.

Objectives

Well maintained, popular parks and facilities that provide multiple outdoor opportunities for residents of and visitors to Louisville to enjoy.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Total Park Acreage		Acres				
Irrigated Park Acreage		Acres				
Non-irrigated Park Acreage		Acres				
Park Maintenance ¹		Hours				
Adopt-a-Park Program ²		Programs				
Efficiency						
Park Expenditures per Acre		Total \$/Acre				
Facility Shelter Rentals		Reservations				
Effectiveness						
Overall Performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department ³		% Excellent or Good				
Adequacy of Parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds ³	Target =	% Essential or ImportantRating 1 to 5 in Spring				
		Rating 1 to 5 in Fall				
Adequacy of Playing Fields ³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5 in Spring				
		Rating 1 to 5 in Fall				
Adequacy of Playgrounds ³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5 in Spring				
		Rating 1 to 5 in Fall				
PPLAB Rating ⁴		Rating 1 to 5				
Net Savings from Using Volunteers ⁴⁵	Target =	\$				

¹ Hours are estimates. Hours only account for Louisville employees. Volunteer and contractual hours are not included.

² Figures represent number of adopt-a-park programs.

³ ~~Based on annual PPLAB review with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.~~

⁴⁵ Gross savings estimated around \$3,500 per year. Estimate 50% deduction for staff time.

Public Safety Program Key Indicators Code Enforcement Sub-Program

Goals

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

Objectives

Judiciously enforce the municipal code; including parking, junked vehicles, uncontrolled weeds, and stray dogs. Work with residents and the business community to achieve compliance with City ordinances. Emphasize education and voluntary compliance over punitive enforcement through the Courtesy Notice program.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Housing Units		Units				
Workload						
Code Violation Summons	# of Summons <u>for Dog Issues</u> ¹					
	# of Summons <u>for Vehicles</u> ²					
	# of Summons <u>for Signs</u>					
Code Violation Warnings	# of Warnings <u>for Dog Issues</u> ¹					
	# of Warnings <u>for Vehicles</u> ²					
	# of Warnings <u>for Signs</u>					
Patrol Hours		Hours				
Code Reports		CE Reports				
Animals Impounded		Impounds				
Parking Spaces w/ Restricted Hours		Spaces				
Parking Citations Issued		Citations				
Efficiency						
Parking Spaces Monitored per Hour		Spaces/Hour				
Ave. # of Days to Achieve Voluntary Compliance or Initiate Inducement Process		Days				
Properties Monitored per FTE		Properties/FTE				
Effectiveness						
Cases Brought into Voluntary Compliance/ All Cases Initiated	<u>Target =</u>	Voluntary/Total				
"Municipal Code Enforcement	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Issues (Dogs, Noise, Weeds, etc.)" Rating ³⁺						
Code Compliance Education Materials Published and/or Communicated	<u>Target =</u>	Publications				
Code Violation Reoccurrences	<u>Target =</u>	Repeat Violations				
¹ <u>Dog bites or vicious/barking dogs.</u> ² <u>Vehicle parking or abandoned/commercial/recreational vehicles.</u> ³ <u>Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.</u> *New code officer hired in 2017 and as result numbers for 2017 are expected to be lower than 2016. An increased is expected for 2018.						

Public Safety & Justice Program Key Indicators Municipal Court Sub-Program

Goals

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

Objectives

Maintain accurate permanent records of citations and payments, administer fair and competent hearings, treat all citizens fairly and equally.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Total Caseload		Total Cases				
Cases Resolved through Mail-in Option		Mail-in Option				
Caseload Requiring Court Hearing		Court Hearings				
Cases Requiring Jury Trial		Jury Trials				
Efficiency						
Ratio of Cases to FTEs ¹		Ratio				
Average Staff Time per Case		Hours				
Average Time for Resolution of Cases		Days				
Effectiveness						
Average Overall Rating of Programs ²	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

¹ Includes Court staff, City Clerk staff, Judge, and prosecuting attorney.

² Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

Public Safety & Justice Program Key Indicators Patrol and Investigation Sub-Program

Goals

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

Objectives

Maintain community safety and a low crime rate through community engagement, effective patrol and efficient response times. Emphasize prevention-oriented police services by engaging community groups in effective partnerships.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Outreach Programs		Programs				
Unduplicated Program Participants		Participants				
Calls for Service/ <u>Officer Initiated Activity</u>		<u>Computer Aided Dispatch</u> Calls				
Watch Total ¹		Hours				
Case Investigation		Hours				
Total Cases Assigned for Follow-up		Cases				
Arrests		Items				
72-Hour Mental Holds		Items				
Addiction Recovery Center Holds		Item				
Reports (Crime, Incident, and Traffic Accident)		Items				
Traffic Citations		Citations				
<u>Alarms Responded to</u>		<u>False Alarms/Total Alarms</u>				
Efficiency						
Ave. Staff Time per Program Participant		Participants/FTE				
Ave. Response Time for Priority 1 Calls		Minutes				
Cases Followed-up per FTE		Units				
Effectiveness						
"Overall Performance of Louisville Police Department" Rating ²		% Excellent or Good				
"Visibility of Patrol Cars" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
"Enforcement of Traffic Regulations" Rating ²	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Cases Cleared	<u>Target =</u>	Cases Cleared				
City of Louisville Crime Rate ³	<u>Target =</u>	Crime Rate				
¹ 2015 staffing reflects officers working 21 FTEs with 80% of time on patrol. 2016 staffing reflects officers working 25 FTEs (2 vacancies) and 2017 staffing reflects 27 FTEs (full staffing). ² Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. ³ National Incident Based Records Part 1 and Part 2 crimes.						

Recreation Program Key Indicators Adult Activities Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Encourage physical activity, intellectual stimulation, and social well-being by offering adult sports leagues, adult educational programs, and other events.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Adult Population ¹		Residents 18-59 Years of Age				
Workload						
Adult Fitness Classes Offered		Classes				
Catalog		#				
Facilities/Equipment Maintained		Units				
Efficiency						
Cost Recovery of Adult Programs Cost per Class (Council Policy Target is 100%)		\$%				
Effectiveness						
"Current Recreation Programs for Adults" Rating ²		% Excellent or Good				
Average Overall Rating of Fit Zone³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				
Adult Participation in Fitness Classes	Target =	Total Attendance in Classes				
Average Overall Rating of Fitness Classes³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				
Average Utilization of Cardio Equipment	Target =	# of Users/Available Equipment				
Average Overall Rating of Cardio Equipment³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				
Average Utilization of Weights	Target =	# of Users/Available Equipment				
Average Overall Rating of Weights³	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				

¹ Based on the most recent [Census Data](#) with "Adult" defined as those 18 years to 59 years old.

² Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

³ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

Recreation Program Key Indicators Aquatics Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide comprehensive aquatics programming that meets the needs of the community through highly accessible, enjoyable, and varied opportunities for learning and recreation. Offer a safe, responsive and welcoming aquatics environment that promotes the health and well-being of residents and visitors.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Water Aerobics Classes ¹		Classes				
Group Swim Lessons ²		Classes				
Private Lessons ³		Classes				
<u>On Deck</u> Pool Maintenance ⁴		Hours				
Swim Lesson Participation		Attendees				
Contract Pool Rental		Lane Hours Rented				
Open Swim ⁵		Hours				
Efficiency						
<u>Open Swim Attendees</u>		<u>Attendees</u>				
<u>Memory Square Pool Attendees</u>		<u>Attendees</u>				
Private Lesson Participant Cost		\$/Class				
Swim Lesson Participant Cost		\$/Class				
<u>Open Swim Cost</u>		<u>\$/Attendee</u>				
<u>Memory Square Pool Cost</u>		<u>\$/Attendee</u>				
<u>Community CPR Classes Offered</u>		<u>Classes</u>				
<u>Lifeguard Classes Conducted</u>		<u>Classes</u>				
<u>Lifeguards Hired</u>		<u>New Employees</u>				
<u>Birthday Party Pool Usage</u>		<u>Birthday Parties</u>				
Group Pool Rental		Hours				
Effectiveness						
Water Aerobics Participation	<u>Target =</u>	Class Attendance				
<u>Net Revenue of Rec Center Pool</u>		<u>Net Rev</u>				
<u>Net Revenue of Memory Square Pool</u>		<u>Net Rev</u>				
Average Rating of Programs ⁶	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
¹ Aerobics classes calculated 15 week @ 50 weeks. 1a. Staff doesn't have accurate numbers to represent actual but will in the future. ² Total number of lessons conducted. ³ Total number of hours private lessons conducted. * Based on no splash pool for lessons. ⁴ Maintenance hours calculated by .25 hour of maintenance completed by part-time staff during operational hours and scheduled shifts ⁵ Hours calculated when the pools were designated as open swim. ⁶ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. ⁷ The American Red Cross has a tier ranking and the Louisville Recreation Center is in the top 7 for the state and 13 for the district for teaching over 1,000 students.					

Recreation Program Key Indicators Golf Course Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide an enjoyable, yet challenging course for residents and visitors of all skill levels. Attract and retain golfers by offering competitive rates and amenities, continuous maintenance and professional management. Operate as an Enterprise by generating sufficient revenue to cover operations, debt service and capital replacement.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Total Rounds		Rounds				
Season Passes		Units				
Cart Rentals		Units				
Total Playable Days ¹		Playable Days				
Guest Lessons Attended		Hours				
Course Maintenance		FTEs				
Marketing Effort		Hours				
Tournaments/Outings/Club Events		Events				
Efficiency						
Average Revenue per Round		\$/Round				
Cart Rental Rev./Cart Lease Debt Service		Rev/Exp				
Average Revenue per Playable Day ¹		Rev-Op Exp				
Effectiveness						
Net Revenue or (Loss) ²	Target =	\$				
Resident Participation ("Played Golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course") ³	Target =	% Response				
Overall Quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course Golfer Rating ⁴	Target =	Rating 1 to 5				
Marketing Effectiveness ⁵	Target =	TBD				

¹ Intermittent or steady rain exceeding 0.25 inches over more than one hour, wind speed exceeds 19 miles per hour, temperatures less than 46 and more than 94 degrees and these NON-playable day criteria are present for more than 50% of playable hours.

² After 100% of capital expenditures.

³ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

⁴ Based on evaluation survey submitted at conclusion of each round with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

⁵ Includes following marketing efforts: Website, Denver Golf Expo, Avid Golfer, Golf Now, Rock Creek Living, Golf Passport, and Unlimited Card.

** Assuming golf learning center is operational

Recreation Program Key Indicators Senior Activities and Services Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Encourage physical activity, intellectual stimulation, and social well-being through programs and services for persons 60 and older.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Senior Population ¹		Residents Greater than 59				
Workload						
Special Events		#				
Fitness/ Health and Wellness Events		#				
Fitness and Sports Events		Items				
Trips		Events				
Daily Lunch Program		Days Open				
Classes and Workshops		<u>Participants</u>				
Volunteer Opportunities		Hours				
Drop in Programs		<u>Participants</u>				
Resources – Information & Referrals		Contacts				
Resources – Community Outreach ²		Participants				
Resources – Support Groups		Participants				
Resources – Loan Closet		Check-Outs				
Efficiency						
Average Cost per Participant Lunch		\$/Participant				
Average Cost per Participant ³		\$/Participant				
Effectiveness						
"Overall of the Louisville Senior Center" Rating ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
"Current Programs and Services for Seniors" Rating ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
Average Overall Rating of Programs ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5				
Average Participants for per-Day Trip Events	<u>Target =</u>	#				
Average Participants for	<u>Target =</u>	#				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Lunch Bunch <u>Events</u>						
<u>Average</u> <u>Participants for</u> Dinner Group <u>Events</u>	<u>Target =</u>	#				
<u>Total Meals</u> <u>Served</u> <u>Average</u> <u>Lunch Count</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Meals Served</u>				
<u>Volunteers</u> ⁶	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rate of</u> <u>Volunteers/Hour</u>				
<u>Silver Sneakers</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Rate</u> ⁷	<u>Target =</u>	<u>% Participation</u>				

¹ Based on 2013 demo from Age Well BOCO Plan and added 150/year. Compared to 2012 CASOA figure to 2013 went up 150.

² Includes Support Groups and Loan Closet check outs.

³ Amount of expenses for number of meals ordered; budgeted amount/estimated number of meals ordered.

⁴ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

⁵ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.

⁶ Based on the rate \$10.50 per hour from the formula Boulder County released for volunteers in 2017.

⁷ Silver Sneakers Colorado Retention Rate is 50% in 2017.

Recreation Program Key Indicators Youth Activities Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide programs which stimulate physical, social, and cognitive skills for the youth of Louisville. Encourage community responsibility through volunteer service that supports the well-being of the community. Provide an individualized learning environment in which each child may grow and learn at their own pace.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Youth Population ¹		Youth 0-17				
Workload						
Summer Day Camp Attendees		Participants				
Preschool Program Attendees		Participants				
<u>General Youth Attendees</u>		<u>Participants</u>				
Teen Program Attendees		Participants				
Youth Sports Attendees ²		Participants				
<u>Youth Sports Volunteer Hours</u>		<u>Hours</u>				
Nite at the Rec Attendees		Participants				
Catalog		#				
Efficiency						
\$ per <u>Summer Day</u> Camp Participant		Exp./Participant				
\$ per Preschool Participant		Exp./Participant				
<u>\$ per General Youth Program Participant</u>		<u>Exp./Participant</u>				
\$ per Teen Program Participant		Exp./Participant				
\$ per Youth Sports Participant		Exp./Participant				
\$ per Nite at the Rec Participant		Exp./Participant				
Effectiveness						
"Current Recreation Programs for Youth" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
Average Overall Rating of Programs⁴		Rating on Scale of 1 to 4				
<u>Average Overall Rating of General Youth Programs⁴</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
<u>Average Overall Rating of Preschool⁴</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
<u>Average Overall Rating of Summer Day Camp</u> ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
<u>Average Overall Rating of Youth Sports Programs</u> ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Rating 1 to 5</u>				
Total Youth Activities Participants	<u>Target =</u>	Participants				
¹ Based on the most recent Census Data with Youth defined as ages 17 and younger. ² Total participants each season. Not unique individuals because many participate in more than one sport or session. ³ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. ⁴ Based on evaluation survey rating customer service with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor.						

Transportation Program Key Indicators Transportation Infrastructure Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

A safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Conserve natural resources by maintaining streets cost-effectively before they reach a point of rapid failure. To ensure a high quality of life and to provide services equitably, no street will be in poor condition. Streets and intersections are monitored, maintained, and adequately lit to move people, bikes and cars safely and efficiently. All arterial and collector streets have marked bicycle lanes. All streets have well maintained sidewalks.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Street Area Resurfaced		SY				
Sidewalk Repaired		SF				
Striping		SF				
Street Area Patched		SY				
Street Area Crack Sealed		LB				
		SY				
Efficiency						
Ave. Cost per Resurfaced Street Area		\$/SY				
Ave. Cost per Resurfaced Sidewalk Area		\$/SF				
Ave. Cost per Patched Area		\$/SY				
Ave. Cost for Crack Sealing		\$/SY				
Electricity Cost per Light		\$/Light				
Effectiveness						
Overall Pavement Condition (Target >75)	<u>Target =</u>	PCI ¹				
Miles of Street in Poor Condition of PCI ¹ <35 (Target 0 miles) ²	<u>Target =</u>	Miles				
Average Condition of Local Streets ²	<u>Target =</u>	PCI ¹				
Average Condition of Collector Streets ²	<u>Target =</u>	PCI ¹				
Average Condition of Arterial Streets ²	<u>Target =</u>	PCI ¹				
"Street Maintenance in Louisville" Rating ³	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
¹ PCI is the Pavement Condition Index. ² Based on most recent street survey conducted. ³ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. *Information determined by condition survey.					

Transportation Program Key Indicators Planning and Engineering Sub-Program

Goals

A safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Design infrastructure to adopted standards that meets the transportation needs of the City. Collaborate with partner agencies (RTD, CDOT) to ensure residents have adequate multimodal transportation options. Proactively redesign the street network as regulations and technology change our transportation needs over time.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Active Projects		Items				
Community Requests ¹		Items				
Efficiency						
Project per Project Manager		Projects/FTE				
Staff Cost % of CIP (Overhead)		%				
Effectiveness						
Number of Traffic Accidents	<u>Target =</u>	Accidents				
<u>Number of Pedestrian/Bike-Related Accidents</u>	<u>Target =</u>	<u>Accidents</u>				
Street and Intersection LOS ²	<u>Target =</u>	Grade				
¹ Official requests from residents for transportation improvements. ² Peak Hour Level of Service for Arterial streets.						

Transportation Program Key Indicators Snow & Ice Removal Sub-Program

Goals

A safe well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Safe traveling conditions for pedestrians and motorists; cost effective snow and ice control services; assist Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services in fulfilling their duties; safe, passable streets, school bus routes and hard surface trails; safe access to City facilities; and snow cleared within 24 hours from sidewalks that are the City's responsibility.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Miles of Streets Plowed		Lane Miles				
City Facilities Shoveled ¹		Square Feet				
Public Parking Lots Plowed ¹		Square Feet				
Miles of Sidewalks and Trails Plowed ¹		Miles				
Deicer Used		Tons				
Category II to IV Snow Events ²		Events/Year				
Efficiency						
Average Cost per Category II Event		\$/# Storms				
Average Cost per Category III Event		\$/# Storms				
Average Cost per Category IV Event		\$/# Storms				
Ave Time to Resolve Category II Events ³		Nearest Hour				
Ave Time to Resolve Category III Events ³		Nearest Hour				
Ave Time to Resolve Category IV Events ³		Nearest Hour				
Effectiveness						
Reported Accidents	<u>Target =</u>	Filed PD Report				
"Snow Removal/Street Sanding" Rating ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				

¹ Completed by Parks Department.

² Category II=2' to 6"; Category III= 6" to 12"; Category IV= over 12".

³ Time from first plow out to all plows back.

⁴ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

Transportation Program Key Indicators Streetscapes Sub-Program

Goals

A safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Safe, visually appealing, appropriately lit and inviting streets, sidewalks and publicly-owned areas adjacent to streets and sidewalks.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Turf Maintenance ¹		SF				
Trees Pruned/Removed ²		Trees				
Planting Bed Maintenance ³		SF				
Total SF of Streetscapes ⁴		SF				
Total SF of Irrigated Streetscapes ⁵		SF				
Total Hard Surface Streetscapes ⁶		SF				
Street Lights		Items				
Efficiency						
Cost per 1,000 SF Turf		\$/1,000 SF				
Cost per Tree		\$/Tree				
Cost per 100 SF Planting Bed		\$/100SF				
Water Score (Irrigation Gal/SF)		Gal/SF				
Effectiveness						
PPLAB Rating ⁷	<u>Target =</u>	Rating 1 to 5 <u>of Residential Corridor</u>				
		Rating 1 to 5 <u>of Collector/Industrial Corridor</u>				
		Rating 1 to 5 <u>of Arterial Corridor</u>				
"Maintenance of medians and street landscaping" Rating ⁸	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
"Street lighting, signage, and street markings" Rating ⁸	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				

¹ Turf Maintenance – Any mowed ROW's adjacent to any public street, includes irrigated and non-irrigated.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
² Trees Pruned/Removed – Trees adjacent to a public street, located on medians, located in entry features and located in adjacent ROW. ³ Planting Bed – Landscape beds (Perennial), Annual Flower beds. ⁴ Streetscape - Any public property adjacent to a public street. Examples are medians, ROW's, and entry features. ⁵ Irrigated Streetscapes – Irrigated medians, Irrigated adjacent ROW's, irrigated entry features and gateways (S-3 – Dillon/McCaslin, Gateway – McCaslin/South Boulder Rd.). ⁶ Hard Surface Streetscapes – examples: cobblestone beds, crusher fines, concrete, brick and asphalt. ⁷ Based on annual PPLAB review with rating on a scale of 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2= Below Average, 1=Poor. ⁸ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.					

Utilities Program Key Indicators Solid Waste, Recycling, and Composting Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Enable residents to dispose of their solid waste in a convenient, environmentally responsible, cost effective manner.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information						
Total Single Family Households ¹		Households				
Workload						
Total Single Family Households Served ²		Households				
Efficiency						
Total Expenditures per Ton of Material		\$/Ton				
Average Monthly Billing Cost/Account		\$				
Solid Waste Tonnage (Landfill)		Tons				
Recyclables Tonnage		Tons				
Compostable Materials Tonnage		Tons				
Effectiveness						
% of Waste Diverted from Landfill ³	<u>Target =</u>	%				
Solid Waste Lbs./Household (Landfill)	<u>Target =</u>	Lbs./Household				
Recyclables Lbs./Household	<u>Target =</u>	Lbs./Household				
Compostable Materials Lbs./Household	<u>Target =</u>	Lbs./Household				
¹ Includes all single family households charged the hazardous waste fee. ² Includes all single family households receiving Western Disposal trash collection services. ³ Includes branch recycling, leaf drop off, and scrap metal recycling.						

Utilities Program Key Indicators Stormwater Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Maintain our storm water system to protect Coal Creek specifically and the natural and built environment generally. Proactively reduce pollutants in the water by educating the public, sweeping the streets, maintaining an efficient & effective storm water system and leveraging intergovernmental partnerships.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Inlets Cleaned		Count/Total				
Quality Monitoring Tests		Tests				
Street Sweeping		Lane Miles				
Public Information and Education Items		Events				
Efficiency						
Cost per Mile of Collection System		\$/Mile				
Maintenance and Repairs per FTE		MR/FTE				
Effectiveness						
CDPHE Compliance	<u>Target =</u>	Full Compliance				
Number Illicit Discharges	<u>Target =</u>	#				
"Storm Drainage (Flooding Management)" Rating ¹	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
Number of Times Each Street is Swept	<u>Target =</u>	Times				

¹ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

* Significant changes from 2015 to 2016 and beyond are due to the change to a program budget and thus a change in allocations.

Utilities Program Key Indicators Wastewater Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Protect public health and the environment by collecting and treating wastewater in compliance with Federal, State, and Local laws.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Sewer Line Jetting and Cleaning		Linear Feet				
Industrial Pretreatment Program		# of SIUs				
Efficiency						
Average Wastewater Treated (Daily)		MGD				
Treatment Cost per 1,000 Gallons ¹		\$/1,000 Gallons				
Energy Usage per MGD		Energy(kWh)/MG				
Available Reclaimed Wastewater Used ²		%				
		MG				
Effectiveness						
CDPHE Compliance	Target =	Full Compliance				
USEPA Compliance	Target =	Full Compliance				
Odor Complaints ³	Target =	Complaints				
“Waste Water (Sewage System)” Rating ⁴	Target =	% Excellent or Good				

¹ The acceptable range for treatment operating cost per thousand gallon is between \$0.95 and \$3.25

² The City's water rights limit the total amount of wastewater that may be used to 65 MG.

³ The acceptable range for odor complaints is between 0 and 10.

⁴ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results.

* Significant changes from 2015 to 2016 and beyond are often due to the change to a program budget and thus a change in allocations.

** Low level Mercury and Effluent toxicity test for quarter two missed due to start-up of new plant.

*** Pass-Through of copper due to excessive levels from Significant Industrial User discharge exceeding authorized limits established in their permit.

Utilities Program Key Indicators Water Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Consistently provide safe and great tasting water, routinely testing quality for compliance with State and Federal Standards. Operate and maintain facilities efficiently, allowing for reasonable and equitable rates while maintaining optimal quality.

INDICATOR		UNIT	2017 ACTUAL	2018 ESTIMATED	2019 PROJECTED	2020 PROJECTED
Workload						
Surveys to Detect Water Main Leaks		Feet				
Water Main Flushing		Feet				
Water Main Valves Exercised ¹		Units				
Potable Water Measured and Billed		MG				
Hydrants Maintained ¹		Units				
Potable Water Produced Annually (MG) ²		HBWTP				
		SCWTP				
Efficiency						
Energy per MGD		E/MGD				
Potable Water Unaccounted ³		%				
Cost per MGD Billed		\$/MGD				
Effectiveness						
"Quality of Louisville Water" Rating ⁴	<u>Target =</u>	% Excellent or Good				
Compliance with State & Federal Standards ⁵	<u>Target =</u>	Full Compliance				
¹ L stands for Low Pressure Zones, M stands for Mid Pressure Zones and H stands for High Pressure Zones. One zone is exercised/maintained each year. ² HBWTP is the Howard Berry Water Treatment Plant & SCWTP is the Sid Copeland Water Treatment Plant. ³ Does not include non-revenue water such as Hydrant Flushing, Backwash, etc. (just Metered vs Produced). ⁴ Based on most recent Citizen Survey results. ⁵ Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) testing completed two weeks late. * Significant changes from 2015 to 2016 and beyond are often due to the change to a program budget and thus a change in allocations.						

**SUBJECT: DISCUSSION ON ASSET RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT FOR
RECREATION CENTER**

DATE: JUNE 15, 2018

PRESENTED BY: JEFF LIPTON, COUNCILMEMBER

SUMMARY:

Attached is an amended worksheet on asset renewal and replacement for the Recreation Center. The goal for this initiative is to set the appropriate reserve for the long-term replacement of City assets. Councilmember Lipton will lead the discussion.

**SUBJECT: DISCUSSION ON ASSET RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT FOR
GOLF COURSE**

DATE: JUNE 15, 2018

PRESENTED BY: DENNIS MALONEY, COUNCILMEMBER

SUMMARY:

Councilmember Maloney will lead the discussion of the level of reserves necessary to fund the long-term replacement of Golf Course assets.